

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 31 March 1992

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 3.30 pm, and read prayers.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION BOARD

Stephens, Hon Tom - Trustee Appointment

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [3.34 pm]: I move without notice -

That Hon Tom Stephens be appointed to the position of trustee on the Parliamentary Superannuation Board in place of Hon Jim Brown.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [3.35 pm]: On the face of it, I do not have any objection to the appointment of Hon Tom Stephens to the Parliamentary Superannuation Board.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Provided there is some money in it!

Hon GEORGE CASH: However, the Opposition needs to research the situation properly since it was not given any previous notice by the Leader of the House.

Adjournment of Debate

Hon GEORGE CASH: I therefore move -

That the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the House.

Question put and passed.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - FIFTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 19 March.

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural) [3.37 pm]: I wish to thank members for their welcome. In particular, I appreciate that several members opposite extended their welcome while speaking in this debate last week, even if, as Hon Norman Moore said, I will be here for only one year. I am sorry Hon Norman Moore is not in this place today; I imagine he has pressing engagements in his electorate. Hon Norman Moore need not worry on my account, and I am pleased to advise that I fully intend to be in this place next year.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Hon KIM CHANCE: In return for Hon Norman Moore's welcome, I express my wish that he also is returned to this place next year, as few things would please me more than to see Hon Norman Moore again occupy the Opposition benches in the autumn session of the next Parliament. Hon Norman Moore makes a great contribution to this place; and I am sure, from discussions that I have had recently with the Chairman of Committees, Hon Garry Kelly, he thoroughly agrees with me.

Mr President, I thank you sincerely for allowing me the privilege of using the facilities of the Parliament during the period between the retirement of Hon Jim Brown and the date of my election. I appreciate that that privilege is a matter of courtesy and not one of right, and I am most grateful.

I think my parliamentary colleagues on this side of the House know how I feel about them. For many years they have been a source of inspiration, good advice and close friendship to me and to my family. While my role as a member of the Australian Labor Party for the last 21 years may have now changed, some things will always remain the same. Foremost amongst those things will always be my commitment to Australia's workers and to their families; and that is my promise to my colleagues, to Parliament and to our electors. My colleagues now understand that my commitment to farmers over the past two decades is motivated by the same ethic and that if I bring anything new to the Australian Labor Party's contribution to the Parliament it will be a better understanding of rural issues and the aims and aspirations of country people.

Hon Muriel Patterson said in her welcome to me that it was good to see another farmer in this place and that it was unfortunate that I was - in her words - in the wrong party. My colleagues disagreed with her in respect of one if not both sentiments. For my part, I follow some of her line of reasoning because I believe I may have heard it expressed once or twice before. All I can say in response to Hon Muriel Patterson is that I hope that in the next few minutes I will be able to explain what I am doing here and why I am doing it. In any case, I thank her for her generosity.

I would like to pay tribute to my predecessor in this place, Hon Jim Brown. Jim's advocacy of country people had few peers in this Parliament and he established standards that will not be easy to meet for any of us who follow. Along with all members of this place, I wish Jim a long, happy and successful career in his chosen role. He has earned the respect and affection of country people and of those who worked with him.

It is time now for me to extend a welcome of my own. My family have deserted their work and their school to watch the proceedings today from the Public Gallery. In welcoming them, I want to thank them not just for their support and encouragement but also for telling me that I was wrong when I needed to be told that I was wrong and for being my best friends when I most needed friends.

I turn now to an item referred to in the Speech by the Governor, Hon Sir Francis Burt, when he outlined some measures of the Government's economic strategy. The Government's commitment to value adding is not new. However, new measures announced in WA Advantage will provide fresh impetus to the Government's aim of creating jobs and wealth for Western Australians - jobs and wealth that are now exported along with our raw materials.

To illustrate the extent of the value of our products once processed, I would like to cite the case of the town of Biella in the Piedmont region of northern Italy. I thought that would be popular with Hon Sam Piantadosi! In giving this illustration, I would like to acknowledge the valuable assistance in researching this information that was provided by the Italian Consul in Western Australia, Barbara Bregato. In and around the town of Biella, west of Milan, there is a wool processing industry that has thrived for centuries. Statistically, many of the mills must be quite small as the 36 000 employees in those mills work in a total of 3 000 factories. These mills have traditionally processed wool from the raw fibre right through to the finished clothing. Modernisation of those factories during this century has led the mills to specialise in the stages of production in which they are most competent, but the industry within the region remains vertically integrated, and that has been the pattern of the industry in the region for centuries. Those 36 000 workers of Biella produce finished product to the value of \$A5 billion. The total value of the entire Australian wool clip exported in the year ended June 1991 was a little over \$A2.8 billion. In other words, Italian workers in and near the town of Biella, and using a fraction of the output of the world's biggest export wool industry, are creating a value added product equal to almost double that of the whole Australian industry.

It is true that Italy is one of the Australian wool industry's most important clients and that its industry produces probably the world's finest product, but these figures from a little town in northern Italy are an awesome reminder of the opportunities that we and every other resource-based economy in the world have allowed to slip by us. As a former wool grower whose father was a member of the Australian Wool Board and one of the architects of the reserve price scheme later introduced by the Whitlam Government, I am proud of the wool industry. This great industry and its pioneers provided our nation with its economic backbone when it most needed one, and led to the exploration and development of the furthest reaches of our country. Even today, after 200 years, wool is amongst our most important export industries and is one of the few, if any, industries in Australia in which we are the undisputed world leader.

However, proud as I am of our wool industry and all its parts - growers, shearers, handlers, the transport industry and the brokers - it is a disgrace that we have been unable to base our manufacturing industry on this massive resource. It is not enough to say that our labour is uncompetitive and then just resign ourselves to becoming a farm and a mine for the rest of the world. If we cannot see by now that the industrialised nations have so corrupted world markets that any nation that chooses to remain resource-based will be bled white, then we are

truly condemned to becoming the poor white trash of Asia. We do not need to reduce pay and we do not need to savage workers' conditions, as New Zealand has done and as the Liberal Party wants to do, in order to improve labour unit productivity. All that will result from that is a level of industrial disputation even higher than the level that we suffered under the last Liberal Prime Minister.

If members are unconvinced that reforms are possible under a negotiated agreement, I invite them to look at the effects of the Waterfront Industry Reform Authority, which have swept the Australian waterfront. The manager of the stevedoring company Conaust in Western Australia was reported in the *Daily Commercial News* as saying that, "In bulk grains, waterfront productivity has risen by 80 per cent since the introduction of the Waterfront Industry Reform Authority program." Australia's productivity per labour unit is already competitive. What is needed now is not a destructive Rambo-type approach to industrial relations but opportunity, enterprise and skill throughout manufacturing industries. I believe WA Advantage is seeking to provide a way of achieving those aims. In presenting the document WA Advantage, the Premier noted that Western Australia had a trade surplus of \$8.8 billion in 1990-91. This trade surplus reflects the influence of the farms and mines of rural Western Australia. However, those farms and mines employ only five per cent of our work force, and the huge wealth creating potential of those raw materials is realised somewhere else. It is realised in North Asia, in South East Asia and in the North Atlantic. It is this group of countries, the industrialised nations, and particularly those of the North Atlantic, that have profited so much from the exploitation of our resources while providing so little in return. Indeed, it could be argued that the industrialised countries prey on all resource dependent countries in the subtle but effective form of neocolonialism. The old colonial masters of the new world no longer have the tiresome problem of administering their colonies. The administration is performed by locals working for their multinational bosses, and the gunships have long since been replaced by the International Monetary Fund. Most important of all, the payoff comes in the form of the profits made from the cheap resources we provide because we are forced to sell in markets deliberately corrupted by market subsidies. The long running trade war which has decimated the wheat market is not a war between the European Economic Community and the United States of America but clearly a war aimed at Australia, Argentina and, to a much lesser extent, Canada. The evidence of this is that the United States has specifically targeted markets such as the Peoples Republic of Yemen which had been exclusively a buyer of Australian wheat. It targeted the Peoples Republic of Yemen as recipients of the export enhancement program for wheat. This was done within days of assuring Australia that only markets now supplied by the European Community would be targeted; but within days the United States was negotiating with Yemen. The EEC was not exporting a single grain of wheat to Yemen and probably never intended to. The truth is that the United States wheat industry was badly hurt by successive foreign affairs blunders dating back to the Carter Administration which had severely reduced its market share worldwide but particularly in the USSR. The vacuum left, following Carter's sanctions on the USSR, was filled by the European Community and by the unsubsidised industries in Australia, Argentina and Canada.

The result of the retribution then carried out by Washington has left a trail of bankrupt wheat growers not only in Australia, Argentina and Canada but also in the United States. The only winners probably were the Russian housewives who, all things considered, really needed a break; but it was a strange piece of logic that saw American housewives end up subsidising Russian housewives. United States envoys and Legislatures have attempted to brush aside Australia's claims for a fair deal. When that has not worked they have simply lied to us. I recognise that United States wheat growers are suffering badly, and I have the deepest sympathy for them - as any farmer has for another farmer regardless of his nationality. However, surely their answers lie within the United States, and their solutions will not be found by deliberately reducing the international price of their own product, which is precisely what the export enhancement program does.

The deliberate corruption of markets by the United States and others does not begin and end with wheat. It is now part and parcel of all resource markets. When the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries attempted to raise the price of oil to a level which would allow its member nations to share in the wealth that their oil created, and to encourage conservation and exploration of a finite resource, they were met with the full force of the

fury of the industrialised nations. It was for the industrialised nations to decide what price oil would be and how, if at all, international wealth would be distributed. The owners and producers of the oil were irrelevant and could have no say. It is history now that OPEC was finally subdued but its stand should be recognised for one of courage and foresight on behalf of all Third World and commodity dependent economies. Even within this country, which is a net exporter of energy, OPEC has not been given its due. An image of OPEC nations was deliberately created in this country to portray them as a handful of greedy and fabulously wealthy Gulf States. Certainly some OPEC nations were wealthy but the bulk of oil exporting nations were poor. Some of them were desperately poor. The only chance they had of raising their living standards was that offered by OPEC and ultimately taken away by the United States and its allies.

The effect of this predation on countries such as Australia, New Zealand or even Libya shows in deficits in their current accounts and reduced activity and profitability in their economies. The effect in the poorer, resource dependent nations of Africa, Asia, and the Central and South Americas is horrifying. Every day thousands of children starve in those countries, not necessarily because the countries are over populated - although almost certainly some are over populated. They starve because the fields which once provided the subsistence crops for the survival of their people are now planted with cash crops so that the interest on the loans authorised by the IMF can be met. Farmers in this Chamber today would understand what that is like on a micro scale. There is no foreign aid; foreign aid is an illusion. If it exists it is something which poor countries deliver to the rich countries because when one adds up the interest paid on those IMF sanctioned debts it far exceeds the foreign aid from the rich countries to the poor countries.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Like banks and farmers.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Exactly. Another effect has been the environmental disasters which have been created in those countries. In the efforts to keep up, the rainforests in Brazil are being decimated daily. The effect has been felt in countries such as Ethiopia, once the bread basket of the Roman Empire and now incapable of feeding its own people. Above all, this predation has created a level of international Third World debt of such a scale that it threatens to destroy the very forces of capitalism which created the problem in the first place. We have a duty to future Australians to use our unique surplus of resources to regain control of our own economic destiny. However we choose to go about that is for us to decide but it cannot be by leaving it until tomorrow nor by appealing to those who are responsible to clean up their act in the GATT or any other forum. They do not care. It is our job to develop our own resources and we need to start now, and here, in Western Australia.

It is worth noting that some of us also aspire to an Australia free of political as well as economic ties to our colonial past. Without entering into a fruitless argument about who deserted whom in the Second World War, I would like to comment on the Prime Minister's statement concerning Britain and Australia choosing their own paths. We are not talking about turning our backs on Britain - even that metaphor is not apt. Britain turned its back on us almost 30 years ago. In joining with its former enemies in Europe it rejected its ties with its old empire. It is time we did the same. Those of us who still feel cultural and ethnic ties with Britain, and I do, will still be free to enjoy those ties whether we have a Queen of Australia or not. Britain had the right to join Europe just as we have the right and responsibility to cut our archaic and pointless ties to a foreign Head of State. Progress towards a republican Australia, however important it may be for some of us, will need to be gradual and even then only when it has the support of more than a simple majority of Australians. Even then it will be a painful process for many people. While the need to process our own resources is much more urgent, it will also have problems, but some of the initiatives of the WA Advantage document, while giving real drive to the initiative, are quite painless. I refer particularly to one element of the program: The direction of three per cent of the State's annual royalty receipts into the investment attraction program to encourage value adding. This initiative will, at no added cost to our mining industries, provide a base for industry to develop downstream processing technology for the benefit of all Western Australians. I believe it is a real investment in the future.

Another aspect of the document which has appeal to me is that of the five proposed industrial parks identified throughout Western Australia - two are proposed for my electorate. One will be located near Geraldton, and I know the location is being discussed now, and the other is at

Meenaar between Northam and Meckering and is virtually ready to start. The fruition of these programs will be a realisation of a long held dream by country people whose populations, and thus their community services, have been decimated by the long years of drought followed by the collapse in international commodity prices. In the last decade the north eastern wheatbelt region lost 34 per cent of its population. The relocation of medium and heavy industries away from the metropolitan area and towards regional centres has always had merit; environmental concerns are more easily managed, and infrastructure costs can be lowered particularly when local raw materials are being used and when surplus infrastructure already exists.

Perhaps most importantly of all, industry is welcomed in regional areas and not treated as some kind of a threat. Location and relocation of industry into regional areas has more relevance than ever before and I know that all members representing country areas will work together to ensure the ultimate success of industrial parks. In the excitement of planning and executing the regionalisation of industry it would be easy to forget that we already have an industrial base in the country. Possibly some members who are not familiar with the Agricultural Region may not be aware of the extent or high quality of manufacturing industry throughout the region. Predominantly steel fabrication industries, these industries usually began by constructing farm machinery or sheet metal products used by farmers such as silos, tanks and grain bins. They have progressed to other, sometimes surprising, products which are sold on local, national and export markets. During the past year I have had the privilege of working in one such industry located in the heart of my electorate. The company was and still is a builder of high quality sealed grain silos and supplies farmers through the whole of the Western Australian wheatbelt from the central wheatbelt town of Kellerberrin. Kellerberrin has a population of 1 500 people. The owner of the business, Mike Moylan, like many others in this type of operation, entered the business world with little more than a trade ticket, some tools, and a great deal of courage and talent. The failure rate of tradesmen who turn to small business is alarmingly high. Fortunately for the people of Kellerberrin Mike Moylan did not fail. He went on to become a successful manufacturer largely because of his own skill in production engineering and with the support of a core of highly skilled workers who were his friends first and workers second. During an earlier downturn in the wheat industry Mr Moylan, who has a long and successful association with the motor racing industry, decided his business needed to broaden its base and produce a product that could be marketed beyond the rural sector. In a display of lateral thinking possible only in the small business arena he became a motor vehicle manufacturer. The Replica Motor Company of Kellerberrin and Welshpool is now on its way to becoming the most successful small volume builder of motor vehicles in Australian history. The company has developed what seems to be an exciting export market. One of its cars incidentally is owned by a prominent Arab ruler and shares a garage with two Ferrari F40s. The cars, replicas of Carol Shelby's Cobras, are recognised for their quality throughout Australia and are soon to be recognised as approved exports by the Automotive Industry Authority.

I mention this case not because it is the most remarkable of its type but to illustrate the boundless energy and versatility of our manufacturers. Other similar industries exist in towns such as Wagin, Merredin and Wongan Hills, all producing very different products but each with a common base and motivation. Many of these companies are now suffering severely from the rural downturn, and obviously those most dependent on the rural market are suffering the greatest difficulty. Sadly some of the largest are now in liquidation or have been and are now trading under altered ownership. It would be a tragic result if we lost these industries which gave such hope to country towns. Prior to their establishment the largest employers in country towns were usually either the shire council or a Government employer such as the local school or, if the town was lucky, the hospital. At their peak the two engineering works in Kellerberrin, M.J. & H. Moylan Pty Ltd and O.G. Cole Engineering, employed a staff more than four times greater than that of the local shire council. With the improvement in farm product prices I am happy to report that some, at least, of these businesses are now operating more profitably than before and that employment is increasing.

It is vital that we look closely at the reasons these companies were established in the first place. Why have some been more successful than others? What could have been done to ensure a flow of work through the slump? It is not until we know the answers to these questions that we will begin to understand the factors which will determine the viability of

manufacturing industries in the proposed industrial parks. Clearly one of the first factors we encounter when we look at the problems these industries face is the cost of money. Even the most devout free market economist will concede that the inherent weakness of a deregulated and basically uncontrolled financial system is the variability of interest rates. At the same time there are no effective mechanisms to target productive and less productive investment sectors. In the absence of controls to regulate consumption of imports high interest rates are the only means the Reserve Bank has to regulate a deficiency in the current account. The procedure is easily enough understood from the central bank's point of view. It sees the problem as an over active economy drawing in too many imports. Imported goods and services are amongst the inputs and therefore if demand is reduced by raising the cost of money, so the demand for imports will decline.

The problem is that using interest rates in such a manner places a brake on the whole economy. In effect, it creates varying degrees of recession which, as we have seen, can gain its own momentum and drive the whole economy into full recession. Interest rates and their use as a means of economic management have a valuable role to play, but if other controls are deregulated and we have to rely almost entirely on interest rates they become a heavy blunt instrument. There is no mechanism within the deregulated monetary system which can distinguish between economic activity resulting in import enhancement and that which results in import replacement or export enhancement. Thus when we raise the cost of money to dampen demand for imports, we also reduce the capacity of the economy to create exports by pretty much the same amount. The net effect of high interest rates on the current account is far less than conventional free market theorists predict for that reason. Monetary controls can have a real impact only when they have caused a full recession and when the heavy blunt instrument has knocked the economy out. There is of course another reason why the response to monetary control is always less than expected by free market theorists. That is because each dollar extracted from the economy by means of high interest rates is returned to the economy by the recipient of the high interest rates. Interest rates are not so much a means of controlling consumption as they are of redistributing money from those capable of lending to those who need to borrow; that is, from the rich to the poor. Thus when we transfer \$20 000 or \$30 000 raised by interest rates from a manufacturer or from a farmer across to an investor we are effectively reducing our exporter's capacity to produce while at the same time increasing the capacity of the passive investor to increase his consumption of, possibly, imported goods. In this case then, the net effect of high interest rates has been to worsen the current account deficit - an effect precisely opposite to the intention of the economic architects. The only winners in this situation are the passive investor, the foreign manufacturer who supplied the goods, and, of course, the bank which negotiated the investor's transaction.

This brings me to the role the private banking sector plays in Australia. I can imagine few greater obscenities than the spectacle of the private banks parading their billion dollar profits at a time when the people who provided those profits are suffering so badly. I have no ideological objection to profits provided that they are fairly earned and are a result of legal and worthwhile pursuits. It is difficult to see how the profits being declared by banks now are either fairly earned or as a result of worthwhile pursuits. Last month a manager for a major trading bank in a wheatbelt branch confirmed that the average interest rate being charged at that time was 14.5 per cent. While that is a substantial reduction on the 20 per cent plus which was previously extorted so ruthlessly, it represents a massive margin of profit. Banks have a wide variety of funds available to them. The cost of these funds varies from nil, in the case of funds held on a cheque account, to around 12 per cent, in the case of some of the older term deposits. With the exception of these deposits the most expensive money borrowed in any scale by banks is the short term, usually 90 day, corporate rate bills. The 90 day bill rates a month ago were below eight per cent. If the bank's average borrowing rate is eight per cent, and as confirmed by the bank manager in the wheatbelt branch, the average lending rate is 14.5 per cent, plus charges levied to cover the bank's administration costs, the bank is generating a margin of 6.5 per cent on money it never had in the first place. It has effectively created credit out of thin air and then extracted a profit margin from it.

The debate on the legitimacy of private banks was conducted long ago, but more recently, along with the deregulation package, we were provided with the opportunity to consider the

effects of greater competition in banking in Australia. Members will recall that the protagonists of increasing the number of banking licences argued that the increased competition would improve the efficiency of and range of services provided by banks to their customers. Those who opposed the proposal argued that increasing the number of competing banks would simply reduce the throughput of each bank, which in response would increase margins in order to keep themselves in the manner to which they had become accustomed. How right they were!

Banks do play a vital role in the economy. They provide a safe and secure network for the transmission of funds, introduce lender to borrower and provide vital statistical information to Governments to facilitate economic management. The question is why do we need so many different banks? Why do we allow private banks to have access to the creation of credit which should surely be the preserve of the public? We have seen the results of allowing increased competition, which has resulted in higher costs to the consumer through lower throughput per bank, and we witness daily the massive wasteful scale of banks advertising campaigns while they compete with virtually identical packages for the limited resource of borrowers and lenders. Virtually all of these expenses impose unnecessary costs upon customers and society. A single State owned bank would have no need to advertise beyond the need to acquaint customers with its services. It would have no pressure on it to satisfy shareholders since it would be owned by the public and it would be free to conduct its business in the best interests of the economy and of the Australian people. It is possible to retain a viable private banking system which meets at least some of these objectives. This is possible through a strong central control of private banks by the public and through the mechanism of the central or Reserve Bank. It is significant that the economies which employed this system in the last decade - for example, Japan, Korea and West Germany - are those economies which have performed much better in this decade than those economies which adopted the freer approach - Britain, United States, Australia and New Zealand.

The proposition that Australia relies too heavily on foreign savings would be generally accepted. When considering foreign investment, which has provided much of the capital base for the major resource projects in Western Australia, it is a matter of concern to many that we have been unable to mobilise Australian capital to take a greater share in our own development. This concern is particularly evident in Western Australia where we will need even more foreign investment to continue our resource development and to establish downstream processing facilities which are so badly needed for those resources.

The reasons offered for the shortage of Australian investment capital are either that Australians are not interested in providing for long term projects or that the economy is too small to fund them. Both reasons are blatantly incorrect. One of the reasons we have excessive demand for imports is that we have a surplus capital base which is not directed towards investment in our productive industries. Various and usually half baked solutions have been offered to overcome this shortage in savings in our own economy, including the allowance for tax breaks on savings to predetermined cut-off points. Savings in this context means more than people adding to their savings banks' accounts, it is the difference between gross earning and gross consumption in the economy and as such includes the whole investment range.

I have described the tax break on savings as half baked because there is no proposal for the direction of these funds so generated. If these funds are used ultimately for the building of more office blocks in the over supplied business districts, or for more housing in what is probably the most over housed society on earth, we have achieved nothing. Tax breaks on savings, without providing a clear use for the huge capital base that would be created actually disadvantages productive industries as it favours passive investment over active investment. This is a real concern in Western Australia with its greater need for active investment than that in more industrialised States. If, however, the capital base can be allocated to a lender which has a clearly defined charter to support the development of productive industries, such as the Commonwealth Development Bank of Australia, the whole proposal begins to make sense. I acknowledge that much of what I have said falls within Commonwealth jurisdiction. However, by definition, the Federal system is dependent upon the States, and vice versa. It is my firm belief that the future prosperity of our State will depend on Australia making decisive and sometimes radical changes to its investment structure and that these changes are unlikely to be made unless they are driven by the Parliaments of the States.

I know that this House is well aware of the problems country people are experiencing; however, I intend to comment on the Liberal Party's Fightback package and its likely effects on country people. The package, particularly the goods and service tax component, claims to be of benefit to country people and to farmers in particular. Some of these claims are misleading and, in representing these claims, the Opposition, perhaps unwittingly, is aiding a cruel hoax aimed at farmers and small business proprietors in general. Of central importance to the Fightback package is the abolition of payroll tax and other business charges, including wholesale tax, which together amount to some \$20 billion per annum. I know of no farmer who pays payroll tax or who has ever paid payroll tax. Similarly, in the non-farm sector about 95 per cent of all private sector enterprises employ less than 20 people. Hardly any of those 95 per cent pay payroll tax because they fall below the exemption threshold. Indeed, when the Premier released the WA Advantage package she announced that because the threshold had been raised some 90 per cent of businesses in Western Australia would be exempt from payroll tax. She did not go on to say the obvious; that is, that those who would be exempt would be small businesses and that that would give an advantage to small businesses against their larger competitors.

Almost all non-farm, private sector employers will have to pay a goods and services tax and the administrative cost of assessing and substantiating the tax, which will replace a tax from which they were formerly exempt! Payroll tax is not popular. Like any other tax, it is an inhibiting factor on employment and profits, but in exempting small business from this tax it has been given a competitive advantage over the larger companies, which is rarely acknowledged. The Opposition promise not only to end that advantage, but also to impose a goods and services tax on the labour component of these businesses value added to the extent of 15 per cent - three times greater than the payroll tax from which they were exempt in the first place. This deception on a micro scale is bad enough, but on a macro scale it is incredible.

The Opposition has said that business charges amounting to \$20 billion will be abolished, thus relieving a huge burden from the embattled business sector. That is great as far as it goes but after telling business it would be \$20 billion better off, the Opposition told the rest of us that a 15 per cent GST will not cost 15 per cent more but 4.4 per cent more, because we will not have to pay payroll tax and wholesale tax, which used to be passed on to us by business, amounting to \$20 billion. It is the same \$20 billion; it has been counted twice. The Opposition must come clean and either admit to the business sector that it conned it and there will in fact be no saving to it or, alternatively, it must tell the public that its prediction of a price increase of 4.4 per cent, 4.7 per cent, or whatever figure it has plucked out of the air, is a con. It is a fraud and the public will be paying an additional 15 per cent on top of current prices, inflated as they are by business charges. It must admit to one or the other.

The Fightback pamphlet which arrived in the mail last week lists in its section devoted to farmers and country people the advantages from cheaper fuel for private and commercial use. The third item on the list is lower road freight costs. While a reduction in the price of road fuel would be welcome, the Opposition must be aware that farmers' principal energy usage is the on-farm use of distillate which is already exempt from excise and has been since it was introduced by the Fraser Government, under the import parity pricing scheme. The Opposition must know that. Not only have farmers always been exempt from excise duty, but so have those people in the fishing, mining and forestry industries. The Opposition should also be aware that freight costs will rise, not fall, under its proposals.

In his contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate Hon Tom Helm said that the increase in freight costs according to the Fightback proposal will be at least seven per cent. He was speaking about road freight costs in the north west and he was, indeed, being kind to the Opposition. The minimum increase in freight costs outlined in that package will, from my calculations, be eight per cent and it will apply anywhere in Western Australia, not only in the north west. Hon Peter Foss in his contribution to the same debate said that Hon Tom Helm was incorrect and that it would go down by 30 per cent. I know Hon Peter Foss is well regarded in this House and that his contributions are usually well researched. However, on this occasion he was wrong and Hon Tom Helm was correct.

Of all the factors which make up the cost of operating a trucking business, fuel is an important component and, as Hon Tom Helm tried to explain, it is not the only component. As a transport operator my fuel costs rarely exceed 20 per cent of my total operating costs.

The figure would be lower than 20 per cent in most operations for two reasons: Firstly, the larger companies would impute debt servicing and administration costs which would reduce fuel costs as a percentage of the total, but this was not part of my calculations. Secondly, the two or three trailer road train configurations which are used for long haul routes are much more fuel efficient than the one trailer I operate. However, using 20 per cent as the fuel component of the road freight costs, it is simple enough to demonstrate that a one-third reduction in fuel prices would reduce the freight cost by one-third of one-fifth. I will not finish that equation, but it is roughly seven per cent. If we add 15 per cent GST to the total retail bill for the service - that is 15 per cent for freight costs, plus 15 per cent for the operation's margin of profit which varies between zero and four per cent - we have a net increase of over eight per cent, and that cannot be refuted.

All country people will pay more for road freight services and those most distant from the point of origin of the goods will suffer the most if the Fightback package is agreed to by the electors. The Opposition will argue that other aspects of its package will overcome this increase in costs and the final result will deliver lower freight charges to people in the north west, Geraldton, Merredin and Esperance. If that is its argument, the Opposition will need to be much more careful in spelling out its proposals than it has been to date. Perhaps it will argue that its industrial relations proposal will result in greater productivity from workers in the road transport industry. Just because the Opposition's record in industrial relations in the past has been an unmitigated disaster, it does not mean that it is not able to develop worthwhile ideas for the future. I am sure that members of the Transport Workers Union, of which I am a financial member, will be interested to hear the Opposition's plans to increase their productivity. If the Opposition believes that transport workers can be made even more multi-skilled and work even longer hours and can survive on even lower hourly, trip money, or subcontract rates, it will find the Transport Workers Union disappointingly intractable.

Of course, the Fightback package makes provision for employers and prime contractors in the transport industry to circumvent the influence of the Transport Workers Union. That is, after all, the fundamental ideology of the Liberal's industrial relations policy. Let us assume for a moment that non-union truck drivers will sign enterprise agreements with their bosses which result in an eight per cent wage cut or an eight per cent increase in driving hours without pay. We will also need to assume that owner drivers will sign fresh contracts with rates at eight per cent lower than at present. What will be the end result for transport consumers in the north west or anywhere else? It will be exactly the same rate as is now being charged because we have an inbuilt eight per cent rise before we start. The costs will be more bankruptcies in an industry already hit by bankruptcies, more road accidents involving heavy transport vehicles and driver fatigue, and lower profits for the bosses. An eight per cent wage cut will not equate to an eight per cent reduction in overall costs.

Why does this seem to be a no win situation? The answer is, of course, that the Fightback package is taxing a service - in this case transport - which previously was not taxed except to the extent that it paid fuel tax. I am not sure that my fellow members of the Transport Workers Union will appreciate the finer points of the Fightback package. The fact that their industry will be taxed as a service in order to ensure that private school fees will not be taxed at all and that mink coats and Porsches will be much cheaper will probably take some selling by the Opposition, particularly to those people on the third floor of the Labor Centre in Beaufort Street.

It was a relief to read in the Fightback pamphlet that farmers will not pay a goods and services tax on exports. Presumably the authors of the pamphlet meant that GST would be rebated when it was paid on top of the cost of inputs to produce those exports. What the pamphlet did not acknowledge was that almost no inputs used by farmers currently attract wholesale tax. The only difference is that under the Fightback package a farmer will have to pay 15 per cent GST and then assess and substantiate the claim he or she makes to the Commonwealth Government in order to receive a rebate at some time in the future. Cash flow consideration aside, it does not seem like much of a swap to me.

No-one is happy with the existing road funding situation. The road funding arrangement between the States and the Commonwealth has left people generally unsatisfied. Between the fuel excise and State fees and charges, road users pour \$8 billion a year into Government coffers. Of that \$8 billion, \$4.7 billion is spent on roads and \$3.3 billion is returned to Consolidated Revenue to fund schools, hospitals, etc. While it can reasonably be argued that

road users should contribute to general revenue to fund the demand they create for hospitals, police and emergency services, etc, I do not think anyone has ever claimed that the demand thus created involves a cost of \$3.3 billion a year. Clearly, road users as a group are making a considerable net contribution to general revenue and usually feel short changed when they compare the price paid with the service received.

Few groups of road users feel more short changed than the users of Great Eastern Highway, our major interstate link which runs laterally through my electorate from Perth to Kalgoorlie. It is the major Western Australian highway in terms of tonnage of freight carried and carries virtually all interstate road transport as well as serving the transport needs of the goldfields and the central and eastern wheatbelt. Much of this highway is pitifully inadequate for its task to the extent that it is dangerous; by comparison with other major highways in the State - that is, Brand Highway, Albany Highway, the North West and South Coast Highways - the Great Eastern Highway - our busiest and what should be our most prestigious link with the rest of the country - is little more than a goat track. In the stretch between Meenaar - which has been mentioned as the site for an industrial park - and Southern Cross, on numerous sections of the road trucks cannot attain the legal speed limit without risking damage. Virtually all the road is too narrow for the safety of passing traffic. The condition of our major highways points to the inadequacy of funding arrangements for roads.

I looked to the Fightback package in the hope of finding some fresh ideas and guidance on this matter. I was disappointed. If an article written by David Kelly which appeared in *The Western Farmer and Grazier* of 26 March 1992 is correct the Fightback package offers little hope for the Great Eastern Highway. He says that as the Fightback package pledges to abolish fuel excise, road funding revenue will fall by the \$5.8 billion presently raised by that excise. In its place the Opposition proposes that roughly \$1.5 billion will be raised from a goods and services tax paid by road users, but, as around half of that amount is paid by businesses and is rebatable, the GST will yield only \$750 million for roads. Mr Kelly pointed to the Interstate Commission as the source of those facts.

When added to the State's contribution of \$2.2 billion that will result in a total road income of \$2.95 billion. Assuming expenditure on roads is not to fall, that will mean a shortfall to come from general revenue of \$1.75 billion to make up the difference. That will presumably be found from the goods and services tax on other items. David Kelly's conclusion was -

There seems to be only one conclusion. We will end up subsidising roads as well as other Government expenditure from our food taxes. That may be a change from subsidising Government expenditure from our road taxes, but it is not progress.

This shortfall in general revenue as a result of road funding is just one example of where the Opposition has failed to explain what will be the effect on Western Australians of decisions made by its Federal colleagues. Among the list of so-called advantages in the Fightback pamphlet is one headed "Farmers and country people will benefit!" Under that heading it states there will be lower interest rates and a more competitive exchange rate. The Opposition claims that all of the extra GST revenue will be devoted to tax cuts and compensation. In doing that the Opposition has ruled out the option of a tighter fiscal policy. This leaves only monetary policy or, if you like, a credit squeeze with sustained high interest rates along with the resulting sustained high - not low - exchange rate with which to manage the economy. This is a situation we have almost become used to. It is definitely not a fightback.

If our State is to progress it will do so by effectively harnessing its resources, both human and natural, and its capital. I believe the program outlined in the Governor's Speech, based as it is on this Government's WA Advantage document, is directly addressing the challenges we face in both human and natural resources areas. Perhaps taking control of our investment structure lies a little further into the future, but is a challenge that needs to be addressed. I thank honourable members for their attention and commend the motion to the House.

[Applause]

HON P.G. PENDAL (South Metropolitan) [4.37 pm]: I support the motion moved by Hon Bob Thomas on 12 March that the Address-in-Reply be presented to His Excellency, the Governor. I join with other members in expressing my good wishes to the Governor, Sir Francis Burt, and his wife, who have attended the Parliament for the last time in their

Vice Regal role. Sir Francis Burt has had a long and distinguished public career stretching back to 1969 when he was first appointed to the Supreme Court bench in Western Australia. The Governor has taken a strong interest in matters historical and those interested in such matters would be aware that he is a past president of The Royal Western Australian Historical Society (Inc). I hope that as a man of distinction and eminence he will consider doing what most people who have held his present position never did; that is, write his memoirs. I wish him and his wife well in their well earned retirement.

I join with other members in congratulating Hon Kim Chance on his election to this House. I commend him for his thoughtful and provocative speech just concluded. I was pleased to hear him say at the outset that he has a commitment to the workers of Australia. That was nice to hear as that commitment is more than we have seen from past and present State Labor Governments. The longer they have remained in office the less in common they have had with Australian, and particularly Western Australian, workers who regard with contempt the way in which this Government and previous Labor Governments under succeeding Premiers Burke and Dowding have treated them.

I will return later to some of the comments made by Hon Kim Chance during his speech because although the first three-quarters of that speech seemed to be particularly well researched, the last quarter, relating to the Federal and State Government Fightback packages, showed a regrettable level of ignorance. He is in good company in that regard because that level of ignorance is matched by most members of the Government in this and the other House.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I wish Hon Jim Brown well in his retirement. He came to the House in the same year as I did and served it and his electorate to the best of his ability. I hope he enjoys his retirement. I also extend my congratulations to Senator Christabel Chamarette, whose position was ratified in this House by a joint sitting of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly only a few days ago.

Hon Mark Nevill: Do you support your leader's remarks?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I will make my own remarks, and I know they are supported by my leader. I happen to believe that Senator Chamarette will give greater service to this State than did her predecessor. Senator Chamarette will be a formidable opponent to any member of this House, as she was on the regional ticket to which I belonged in the 1989 State election when she represented the Greens.

I congratulate Hon Garry Kelly on his appointment as Chairman of Committees, and on the confidence of the House that is implicit in that appointment. My only regret is that the Australian Labor Party's selection process does not have the same faith in Mr Kelly as this House had in electing him to that high office. I genuinely regret the fact that he has been chopped off in his political prime. I think it is disgraceful that the media have allowed a member of this House who has been Mr Kelly's political assassin to get away with what he has done. Finally, it is also extraordinary that the media have let the Premier off so lightly, given the fact that it is less than a year since the Premier made a commitment to her members, following the bloodletting of the Cabinet reshuffle 12 or 13 months ago, that she would move to protect the endorsements of all Australian Labor Party members. I find it somewhat interesting to draw a parallel between the attention given by the media during January to the preselection difficulties of a member on this side of the House, Hon Derrick Tomlinson - bearing in mind that, whatever else we might think, it was from their viewpoint a legitimate news story - and the attention they gave to Hon Garry Kelly's position. It is interesting, to say the least, that that same media attention was not focused on the fight that has seen the end of Mr Kelly's political career.

Hon Tom Stephens: Not at all.

Hon John Halden: You are just wishing.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: In case anyone suggests that it is only I who have some interest in this matter, I will tell the House that the question of preselection for Hon Garry Kelly and other

members in the southern suburbs is alive and well in the Australian Labor Party branch of Mt Pleasant-Brentwood, the minutes of which I have sent to me each month.

Hon Mark Nevill: Are you a member of the Labor Party?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I have made many mistakes in my time, but joining the Labor Party is not one of them.

For those who are interested, incidentally, at that Australian Labor Party meeting in Mt Pleasant-Brentwood on 19 February - and Hon Cheryl Davenport would know, because she was there - the ballot positions for South Metropolitan Region were rejected by the branch. It also expressed its serious alarm at the contents of the Government's juvenile justice legislation which passed through this House only a few weeks ago. It is interesting that at the same meeting it was indicated that the South Metropolitan ticket was still the subject of an appeal, which had not been finalised. We now know that Hon Garry Kelly's fate has been sealed and that that appeal to the Federal body of the ALP has been rejected. It was particularly galling to Mr Kelly that the outcome of that appeal should have been known to one of the major media outlets in this town, which had the decision sent by fax to it, scrawled with a note from another Labor member of this House, who drew attention to the fact that the appeal was now finished and that Mr Kelly's career was presumably at an end. I do not think that is the way to treat a colleague of some considerable years' standing, and I am sure Hon John Halden would agree with me.

Hon John Halden: I would, but I was in Canberra at the time.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: But that did not stop Hon John Halden from sending a fax to the media -

Hon John Halden: You are wrong. Whatever story you have is wrong.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: - without Mr Kelly's knowing the outcome of the Federal party's decision.

In the course of my address today I will touch on three matters. Firstly I will refer to the question of State finances and how seriously they have come to the brink of collapse. Secondly, I want to spend some time on a quite remarkable political process we are going through in Western Australia, whereby I believe that five or 10 years down the track it will be seen that we are now going through an era which is marking the death of the modern Labor Party as we know it, and I will give the reasons for that. Thirdly, I want to deal with what has now become a hallmark of Labor politics around Australia; that is, if one cannot find a good argument to back up one's claims, one should make up the story and tell untruths, because that is certainly the case with the goods and services tax, with tariffs in Australia, and with what the Government is seeking to do to undermine the North West Shelf gas project, which is the heart and soul of the Pilbara and which is so important to the future expansion of Western Australia.

It is no secret, because it was reported in *The West Australian* and other media a few weeks ago - I believe on 11 March - that, with two-thirds of the financial year having passed, Western Australia's Consolidated Revenue Fund is in a most parlous state. For those who have forgotten, I remind them that as at the end of February, two-thirds into the financial year, the Western Australian Consolidated Revenue Fund was running at a deficit in the order of \$387 million. I believe that the State Government's finances now are on the brink of collapse and have been since those figures were arrived at late in February and released early in March. One would think that, if nothing else, the Government would be able to make arrangements at least to pay its own bills, but the matter has become so serious that, for example, a meter reader from the State Energy Commission arrived at my electorate office on 11 March and left a disconnection warning there.

Hon R.G. Pike: You are lucky - it could have been water.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Indeed. My secretary, being an efficient secretary, wondered why someone from the SEC was attending to the meter box when someone had been there several days before to read the meter. To all outward purposes this second person was doing the same thing again. My secretary therefore asked what was going on and the person said he was issuing - indeed, he did issue - a disconnection warning because the bill for \$206.65 had not been paid. He said it must be paid within 24 hours or the electricity to my office, a

Government office, would be cut off. My electorate secretary explained to him that it was not the responsibility of the member of Parliament to pay that electricity bill but rather that of the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet. The person replied that it did not matter and that a number of Government bodies were on the SEC's disconnection list, including Government House. Who pays the electricity bill of Government House? The Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet. If that is not an indication - the person left behind an indication that this was happening right across the board - that this Government is so broke that it cannot afford to pay its bills, I do not know what is. Also, the State Energy Commission, being a semi-autonomous body, does not intend to be left holding the baby.

Hon Peter Foss: You had better move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply to warn His Excellency of what is about to happen.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is not a bad idea, Mr Foss, although I remember last time we moved and passed an amendment to the Address-in-Reply the strongest complaints were from the great custodians of the monarchical system; that is, members of the ALP who said that could not be done and was not correct.

Hon Fred McKenzie: What about Parliament House?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I do not know about that, but there is certainly not a surplus of funds around this place. I understand that a few bills went unpaid for a long time for the same reason: The State is broke.

Hon Fred McKenzie: No, because of over expenditure.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: As Hon Fred McKenzie goes into retirement he has the pleasure of knowing that he, although a decent fellow as an individual, has helped by his silence to place the State in a grim financial position. The Premier has made some suitably consoling noise about the finances of the State and the Government's ability to come out of its financial dive. That is the hallmark of the Premier: Her words on that subject were replicas of those comments regarding unemployment, which has risen by 64 per cent under her stewardship.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Oh, come on!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: No Premier in the history of Western Australia, even in the depth of the great Depression, has done that. The Minister who just interrupted is supposed to be the Minister in charge of employment opportunities in Western Australia. She might well leave the Chamber because she, like the Premier, is ashamed of the legacy she will leave because this matter goes to the heart and soul of what a Labor Party policy should be.

Hon John Halden: You have forgotten 1983 and 1984.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I indicate to the Chamber the figures which the Minister did not want to hear. When Dr Carmen Lawrence - the saviour of the working people as we have heard in a speech today - became Premier, 57 000 Western Australians were out of work; two years later under the skill of this woman 93 000 people are out of work. Nevertheless Labor Party members sit in this place grinning about a trumped up document prepared by the Premier a month ago to try to save the party from the doom which it will face at the next election.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Speak to us about your environmental policy, Mr Pendal! Tell us about the Churchill estate. Maybe you can find it in 1992.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Labor movement will never forgive this woman. She has presided over the demise of the modern Labor Party, as this State has known it. It is a question of not just the job catastrophe which will be left behind in the wake of the \$1 500 million lost through WA Inc, but also the fact that major unions will seek to disaffiliate themselves from the Labor Party. Those unions do not want to be dragged down to the gutter to where Labor Party members have taken themselves. I suggest that we will see more and more unions disaffiliating from the Australian Labor Party. The Construction, Mining and Energy Workers Union - an 8 000 member body - decided 10 days ago to disaffiliate itself from the Labor Party. What was the explanation from that union chief for that action? He said that the ALP was increasingly irrelevant to workers; these are the very workers to whom Hon Kim Chance just pledged himself in his maiden speech.

Hon Tom Stephens: You can be sure that they will not want to affiliate with the Liberal Party.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: In the north west in the past fortnight a major union has sat quietly by in the face of the dismissal of 200 workers - not a whimper was heard from the union. Why? The union concerned is more prepared to see the ALP win the Ashburton by-election than to defend the rights of the ordinary workers to a job. I am sure that Hon Kim Chance means what he says about his commitment to the ordinary Australian worker, but if he does he will be the only member of the Australian Labor Party in this place to take that attitude.

Hon Mark Nevill: It is good to hear your speech again.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: In spite of these ratings the Premier has not been able to deliver on the promise that no Labor Party member would lose his or her endorsement between now and the next election; I referred to this point earlier regarding Hon Garry Kelly.

The electorate forgives people for a whole range of political sins. However, the one thing for which the electorate will never forgive the Labor Party is the massive unemployment members opposite have visited upon the people of this State. This will be placed on the political gravestones of members opposite: "Members who were prepared to sit by and do nothing on behalf of those people who have been out of a job as a result of their Government's policy." People have had the gall, in this House and elsewhere - I refer to our economically illiterate Premier and some like people who should know better - to condemn the Federal Opposition for offering a tax reform policy in this country.

Hon John Halden: For the benefit of the rich. If you're on \$70 000 a year you'll be right, mate. Otherwise, you'll be worse off.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: If such a policy is for the benefit of the rich, why was the goods and services tax policy advocated by Mr Halden's most recent Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, and by his current Prime Minister, Mr Keating? Were they wrong?

Hon John Halden: They were wrong and they backed off.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I thank the member. Let us consider what the former great apostles of the working people had to say only a couple of years ago about the need for tax reform and what a broad based consumption tax would provide for the community.

Hon John Halden: It is not relevant.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is not relevant to the member. During the 1984 election campaign Mr Hawke was asked the question: Are you not taking a heck of a risk in advocating the adoption of a consumption tax; is it worth it? Mr Hawke's reply was as follows -

Yes, we are taking a risk. . . What this country has needed desperately for years now is a government which is prepared to face up to what has to be done to get this economy in proper shape . . .

Hon George Cash: Stunned silence opposite.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The former Prime Minister could not have mucked up the economy more if he had introduced a consumption tax of 50 per cent at that time! He refused to pursue this policy and he went to jelly - he was called "old jellyback". However, he still managed to muck up the economy. The matter does not stop there. Hon Kim Chance talked this afternoon about general taxation and payroll tax and the way in which the goods and services tax would affect -

Hon T.G. Butler: It was a well thought out speech.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It was well thought out, but the speech came from the same bloke in the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet who helped write Hon Bob Thomas' speech and he is as economically illiterate as the Premier.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If members do not come to order I will be forced to take some action. I suggest they listen to what the member has to say.

[Questions without notice taken.]

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I remind the House and particularly Labor Party members opposite that the pioneers of the consumption tax debate in Australia were the former Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, and the current Prime Minister, Mr Keating. On 4 June 1985 in the Willesee

program Mr Hawke was being questioned, interestingly enough, about the sorts of things canvassed tonight by Hon Kim Chance. For example, he was asked whether there would be ruination of business with the introduction of a broad based goods and services tax. The transcript of Mr Hawke's response is as follows -

We don't believe businesses will be ruined as a result (on the introduction of a consumption tax). There is no evidence to suggest that they will be.

Is that not a remarkable conversion to an opposing point of view? Having run out of the political will to bring about tax reform in Australia, the Labor Party now wants to belittle and denigrate the people who have that courage. It comes down to that in the end - not whether the policy is right. The policy is bipartisan, as I have just demonstrated. Therefore, it is a matter of who has the political guts to do something about tax reform in this country. A measure of the desperation of these people is that they overlook what is now sinking through in the Ashburton electorate; that is, the people of Ashburton know, because the Liberal Party has gone out of its way in its direct mail campaign to inform them, what personal income tax reform will mean with dollars in the wallet for people in that region. I advise Hon Tom Stephens, who represents that area, that the differences between the tax scales of the Hewson and Keating packages are underpinned by the fact that we shall have a broad based consumption tax. One cannot have personal income tax reform of the kind I will read into the record without at the same time a reform of the taxation system as a whole.

Under the Keating tax scale announced in the One Nation package a few weeks ago, on income levels between \$10 000 and \$100 000 a year on every increment people would receive vastly more back under the Hewson tax reform than they would under the Keating tax reform. For example, I refer to the comparisons published independently of the Liberal Party or the Government which suggest that under Mr Keating's proposal a person on an income of \$10 000 a year would gain nothing but under Dr Hewson's plan the gain would be \$8.30 a week. A person on \$20 000 a year under Mr Keating's package would similarly gain nothing, but under Dr Hewson's plan would gain \$15 a week. The Labor Party package would return \$14.30 a week to an employee earning \$30 000 a year, and Dr Hewson's proposal would mean a return of \$30.40 a week. The increments go right through until the penultimate salary of \$90 000 is reached.

It is interesting that the Premier chose to deal with that salary level yesterday in her dishonest attempts to suggest that everyone in the Ashburton electorate would pay another \$8 000 a year under the Liberal Party's goods and services tax proposal. The Premier did not tell the people - like the rest of the members of Government she lacks the honesty - that the figure she chose under the Keating tax scale would involve a weekly gain to the taxpayer of \$47.30 but under the Hewson tax scale it would mean a gain of \$149.70. That is a clear \$100 a week advantage. That is the reason I suggest the Premier is going down the road of her two predecessors; that is, when they get into trouble they tell fibs because they can fool most of the people most of the time. That is the moral basis upon which Government members, and especially the Minister, govern Western Australia.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I advise Hon Phillip Pandal that he is sailing close to the wind in referring to people telling fibs. We are dealing with parliamentary language in this House so he must be careful with his words.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Government is telling untruths. It is lying when it says the things it says.

Withdrawal of Remark

Hon TOM STEPHENS: That is unparliamentary language and I ask the member to withdraw.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Garry Kelly): I uphold the point of order. The member cannot impute those sorts of motives to members of the Government by saying the Government is lying. He might be able to say the Government is mistaken or is misleading the electorate, but he cannot get away from the fact that the Government comprises Ministers and members, and to say that the Government is lying is the same as saying that a member is lying.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I withdraw that statement.

Debate Resumed

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Members know that the Government is not telling the truth, and to me the destination is still the same.

On 5 June 1985, Paul Keating, who is now Prime Minister, and who is now telling the Australian people that we cannot possibly survive a goods and services tax, spoke to the National Press Club and stated, "There are three main advantages of a consumption tax." I would be happy to read into the record the three advantages, but the first is sufficient for my argument.

Hon Mark Nevill: Read Malcolm Freaser's comments on payroll tax in 1975.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I will get to that in a moment. Mr Keating stated -

First, it will allow a more rational indirect tax system than the current anomaly-ridden wholesale tax, which has multiple rates, numerous exemptions, and fails to tax the services sector.

They are the very matters that are addressed in Dr Hewson's package, which members opposite now condemn, yet five years ago Mr Keating said that would be the salvation of the nation.

Hon T.G. Butler: You need to have an argument for introducing it yourself.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I do not need to have an argument to satisfy Hon Tom Butler. Let us come a bit closer to home because if Hon Tom Butler does not like my words, I will try him out on some of the words of his own colleague Hon Julian Grill, who was despatched to the backbench for fear of what might come out about his activities with WA Inc. Mr Grill does not believe that the Labor Party is taking the country in the right direction. He believes that it is selling out the Australian workers. Mr Grill stated on 5 November 1991, in a paper entitled "The Economic Challenge - Securing a Better Future", at page 4, that -

The overriding public perception in Australia today is that the Federal Government has lost control of the economy and has all but abdicated from any meaningful economic debate.

They are not my words. They are the words of one of the leading economic Ministers of this Government - I might say one of the few who actually knew anything about economic matters before he was booted out by members opposite a few months ago. Mr Grill stated at page 5 of the same document that -

The present Federal Government's economic policy is termed either freemarket economics or economic rationalism (with its connotation of the much quoted "level playing field").

It is, however, nothing more than half hearted Thatcherism with a wages accord tacked on the end.

Hon Mark Nevill: And you want a more extreme form of it!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is not my policy that he is criticising; it is the policy of members opposite. It is the very policy that members opposite have locked themselves in behind, and it is the policy that will send them to the political scrap heap because the Australian people and the supporters of members opposite will not tolerate the level of unemployment that they have visited upon them.

I turn now to payroll tax.

Several Government members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest to those Government members who are interjecting that interjections are out of order, but if they want to interject it would have much more effect if there were one interjection at a time rather than several. I suggest that the House direct its attention to Hon Phillip Pendal.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Hon Kim Chance, in his maiden speech, made much of the Opposition's pledge to get rid of payroll tax, and by way of interjection a few minutes ago Hon Mark Nevill defended the Government's position not to get rid of payroll tax. He wants to keep payroll tax.

Hon Mark Nevill: That is not what I said.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Yes it is. He either wants to get rid of payroll tax or he does not. There is no in between.

Hon Mark Nevill: Tell us what Malcolm Fraser said about payroll tax in 1975.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Malcolm Fraser is about as relevant as members opposite will be in a couple of months' time. Mr Nevill's own brother-in-law, the not late lamented Premier, Brian Burke, went to the electors in 1983 with the promise to get rid of payroll tax.

Hon Mark Nevill: Hon Brian Burke is not my brother-in-law.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I am sorry; I thought he was. I do not blame Hon Mark Nevill for not wanting Brian Burke to be his brother-in-law. I apologise if I called Brian Burke the member's brother-in-law because anyone who had him as a brother-in-law would get a bad name out of it.

The question of payroll tax is fundamental to the Fightback WA document. The abolition of payroll tax in Western Australia is equivalent to 17 500 full time jobs in the work force. I have noticed that by way of correct interjection several times in past debates Hon Mark Nevill has said it is not necessarily equivalent to 17 500 jobs, and neither is it, but we are saying that the capacity of private industry and, for that matter, the public sector to expand its employment base will be increased immeasurably as a result of the abolition of payroll tax, and that the equivalent in money terms is the creation of 17 500 new jobs in Western Australia.

Hon Kim Chance stated in his speech that payroll tax is irrelevant in country areas because most farmers do not pay payroll tax. I will concede that, but is he saying that CSBP does not pay payroll tax?

Hon D.J. Wordsworth: Farmers pay payroll tax when they pay their shearing teams.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Yes. I will come to that. Hon Kim Chance, in purporting to put forward a rural view, is enormously misinformed. Is he saying that Wesfarmers, a major Western Australian company, does not pay payroll tax because it is beyond the exemption level? Is he saying that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd does not pay payroll tax? The impact on farmers, not only in the way that Hon David Wordsworth has pointed out by way of interjection but also in other ways, is immense. Therefore, the country areas of this State will be the first to benefit from the abolition of a tax which is a tax on employment.

Hon Tom Stephens: Would you agree that the current arrangement is an advantage to the small business sector?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: My time is running out. I am not about to agree with anything that Hon Tom Stephens interjects about.

The Fightback WA document also begins, thankfully, to address a problem that has been allowed to go unchecked by the current Government; that is, the level of State debt. If Government members are proud of a record where net borrowings have increased in excess of \$10 billion - and fully 10 per cent has occurred in the last year - and if they are satisfied with that level of economic management that directly impacts on the Government's capacity to do other things, they have lost touch with the people of Western Australia to an extent that even I would not have imagined.

Another area that goes to the heart and soul of State Government funding is the way in which the infrastructure has been allowed to collapse in the nine years since Mr Burke took office and has continued to this day under Dr Lawrence. I quote now from page 35 of the Fightback WA document. For those who are not satisfied about the source, the figures are taken from the Western Australian Budget papers.

Hon John Halden: You will get them wrong. In other speeches I have heard you get the figures wrong.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: If that is the case, it is because the Treasury has got it wrong. The document states -

Back in 1983-84, for every dollar allocated to current government purposes, i.e. wages, telephone, consumables, etc., around 42 cents went towards capital works for the construction of new economic and social infrastructure.

I will restate that in layman's terms: For every dollar that went out by way of Government spending, 42¢ of it was being spent on projects of long term benefit - schools, hospitals, highways and so on. Nine years later under this great Government and under this Premier - with her record of economic illiteracy - that figure has dropped from 42¢ to 26¢ -

Point of Order

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Mr Deputy President, I draw your attention to Standing Order No 97, which I think the member has just breached.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Calling the Premier an economic illiterate is embarrassing but it is still accurate.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Garry Kelly): Order! The terminology used by the member, while not being pleasant, does not fall into the category of unparliamentary language.

Debate Resumed

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I can understand the member's being sensitive about that but that is the seriousness of the infrastructure collapse. I repeat that the 42¢ in the dollar being spent on projects nine years ago, when the Labor Government took office, has plummeted to 26¢.

Whichever way one looks, the Government is in financial ruin; it cannot pay its bills. It is shuffling paper around; it is deferring payments in every way it can to see its way through to the end of the financial year. The person who visited my office to disconnect the power knew more about what was going on than do members of the Government in this House, because he was told to go out not to private homes which would not pay their bills but to Government departments and, in his words, even to Government House, which apparently had not paid its bill either. Every indicator points to economic ruin. The Moody's Investors Service rating has been renewed downwards on so many occasions - most recently last year. That is no laughing matter. That affects our ability around the world to attract investment and to be an attractive place for people to invest in. It is no different from what the Premier is doing now in seeking to renegotiate the contracts for the North West Shelf gas. That is putting the fear of God into the major companies, such as Woodside - and Hon Mark Nevill knows this - who say publicly that that is sending out frightening signals to the rest of the investment world.

Several members interjected.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The best we have is that sort of babble coming back in debates of this kind.

Hon Mark Nevill: This is the speech of a rattled man.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The only people who are rattled in all of this are members of this Government, which is unable to balance its budget. It is a Government that cannot keep up with its infrastructure needs, a Government that is forced, against everything it believes, into selling major public institutions that it holds very dear to its heart. Frank Wise would turn in his grave to hear that the Government has been forced, out of economic necessity, to back down and sell the R & I Bank. Every day I am irritated to see advertisements on television by the State Government Insurance Office telling us how good that office is for the community of Western Australia, when it has been raped and pillaged by the Government. In the end, the money comes from the people. Money is not found by some magical Government source that does not impact ultimately on the people. So serious has the matter become that the Government has reversed 90 years of political philosophy and will now get rid of the R & I Bank and the SGIO. Is it not ironic that the minute the Opposition says that it is nice to see the Government up at the barrier, and that while we are at it we will privatise a few institutions such as State Print -

Hon Tom Stephens: And Stateships. Tell the people in the Ashburton electorate about that.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Someone in the private sector is prepared to buy Stateships and give a service to the people of the north and not waste money as the Government has for the past nine years.

Hon Mark Nevill: Sell it to the lowest bidder!

Hon Tom Stephens: And without any guarantee of service.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Members opposite are understandably itchy about the issue. They are the great protectors of all the big public institutions that lose money hand over fist -

Hon Mark Nevill: Stateships is responsible for lowering freight prices in the north.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Can the member tell me why the Government has a selective list for privatisation? Why has the Government sold its principles over the R & I Bank and the SGIC but not Stateships? The answer is that the unions with Stateships have more clout than the other people. The member does not have the fortitude to take on some of those people in the public sector who tell him how high he must jump.

Hon Tom Helm: What about the Seamens Union?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I do not have time to tell the House what is wrong with the Seamens Union. I am pleased that the impact of the Fightback WA document is taking its toll on the Labor Party, otherwise it would not be spending such an inordinate amount of time attacking it, misrepresenting it, sending it to Federal and State Treasuries, and using public funds in a less than honest way. That is just as the Government has used the Kingair aircraft, which costs the taxpayers an arm and a leg, to fly people to the Pilbara to take part in a political campaign. Do members opposite know that in the current British election the minute the Prime Minister, Mr Major, called the election he was required under British law to start paying his own aircraft fares - as was Mr Kinnock, the Labour leader? What does that bunch of people opposite with their snouts in the trough do? They use the Kingair on the public payroll and break every rule of propriety in the book.

Hon Mark Nevill: You do not want to disclose your donations.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: What does the Government say about that? It says it costs only \$1.4 million a year to keep that plane to swan Ernie Bridge around, and when he is not using it, to bung some Labor politicians in and cart them around for a by-election. Members opposite are so far into the moral abyss that they do not even know they are there. They think it is funny.

Hon T.G. Butler: Who gave the Aborigines at Turkey Creek a barrel of wine?

Hon John Halden: You do not want to talk about that.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is the reason that a major trade union is disaffiliating itself and withdrawing funds from the Labor Party. It is why that union has made a formal representation to the Trades and Labor Council for all union funding of the Labor Party to be discontinued.

Hon Fred McKenzie: Since when has Hon Phil Pendal been a supporter of the CMEU?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Never.

Hon Mark Nevill: It is not seeking an affiliation with the Liberal Party.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The point of my remark is not that the union never supported the Liberal Party but that it used to support the Labor Party and 10 days ago it pulled the pin on the Labor Party. The union said that it would not put money into an organisation - and these are the union's words - which has become irrelevant to the working men and women of Australia. Nothing can condemn the Labor Party more viciously than those words of the union: The people opposite and their Government have become irrelevant to the working men and women of Western Australia.

HON TOM STEPHENS (Mining and Pastoral - Parliamentary Secretary) [5.53 pm]: Mr Deputy President (Hon Garry Kelly), I congratulate you on your election to another position; that is, the Chairman of Committees. I wish you well in your new role in this House and I am sure that the expressions of congratulation that you have received from both sides of the Chamber indicate to you that you have the support of the House as you take on the arduous responsibility of being Chairman of Committees and a Deputy President. I am sure that you will do an excellent job and I look forward to the occasional display of mercy that I seem to need from the Chair.

Hon W.N. Stretch: Are you looking for a coup de grace?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Mr Deputy President, you arrived in that position because of the

opportunity provided to you with the resignation from the House of Hon Jim Brown. I join with other members in placing on the official record my good wishes to that honourable member on his retirement from the House. In the time that he was a member of this Chamber he earned the respect of his colleagues from all sides and was held in very high regard in his old electorate. I am sure that members, again from all sides of the House, wish him well in his new career away from the Parliament. He has the singular distinction of having previously been a member in the other place before being elected to this House.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: We have names coming from all sides of the Chamber, so maybe it was not a singular distinction.

Hon Reg Davies: Hon George Cash.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I had forgotten the Leader of the Opposition. No member should ever claim for any member of the House something that is singular; he will find other examples springing up from everywhere. No doubt there are hundreds of people who have had careers in the other place.

Hon Peter Foss: Is there anybody who has not?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I discovered the error of doing that when I claimed that I was the youngest member ever elected to this House. Somebody soon trotted out the name of a member in 1890 who had been elected when a month younger than me; so we should never claim for anyone in this House a singular distinction.

With the departure of Hon Jim Brown comes the arrival of Hon Kim Chance, and I congratulate the new member and welcome him to this House. Along with other members, I was extremely impressed by the quality of his contribution to this debate this afternoon. The broad range of issues that he covered in his contribution to this debate was clearly very impressive. The command of issues he demonstrated is a delight for those of us on this side of the House as we see arriving in our midst a member clearly able to hold his own in this Chamber.

Hon Peter Foss: Has he done more research than you?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: No doubt. I want also to mark another recent retirement from this Parliament. It is the retirement from the other place of my friend and colleague, Mrs Pam Buchanan. Pam Buchanan and I have worked together for some 12 years in the north west of this State in our association with the Labor movement to ensure Labor representation in the top end of Western Australia. I first became a friend of Pam Buchanan's soon after the 1980 election when she moved from her position as a employee of Cliffs Robe River to take up the position of electorate secretary to Hon Peter Dowding, my former colleague and member for North Province. Pam Buchanan came from the township of Wickham and in serving in the role of electorate assistant to Peter Dowding for some three years was building on a career that she had previously constructed from her association with the iron ore industry. Prior to that she worked in the township of Roebourne in a quality way in the local community, introducing into the town day care services, playgroup activities, child care arrangements and preschool facilities.

Hon T.G. Butler: That will all go under a Liberal Government.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Pam Buchanan brought to the Parliament, as the representative of the Pilbara region for which she was elected in 1983, a real passion and commitment to improving the quality of life for the families of the Pilbara and the top end of our State. She introduced an aspect to politics that was quite novel -

Hon Peter Foss: She resigned from the Labor Party.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I thought that in the context of a moment like this Hon Peter Foss might rise to the occasion and recognise that I am placing on record sincere wishes for my friend and colleague Pam Buchanan on her retirement from this Parliament. I would have hoped that I would have the opportunity to do that without people failing to recognise the significance of this moment as being the official opportunity to place on record my appreciation of her career.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Mrs Pam Buchanan made a great contribution to the Pilbara region during her time as member for Ashburton. On the occasion of her retirement from Parliament I take the opportunity of placing on record my appreciation of the work she did. When she arrived in this Parliament in 1983 she was part of a new era of politics in the Pilbara. She brought to the region a softer side of politics. Previously, the Pilbara region was very much part of a rugged ethos and, as a previous member's wife wrote in her book about the life of Arthur Bickerton, it was an area covered in red dust. In the early 1980s Pam Buchanan entered Parliament along with many members of the new Labor Government. Pam Buchanan brought to our attention the particular needs of families, women, young people and Aborigines and others faced with disadvantages in that region. Within that context she worked for nine years. Instead of a region studded with the stains of red dust, town after town is now blessed with facilities such as cultural centres, recreation centres, youth centres, aged care facilities, child day care centres and women's refuges. They are a tribute to the work of Pam, her colleagues and the Labor Government.

Regularly constituents in that area mention the contrast of the conditions prior to 1983 and after. The Pilbara was previously considered to be frontier country and was country that families sometimes found intimidating and, consequently, they did not rush to set up residence in the north west. However, now many families have come to the Pilbara to stay. In the 1970s and early 1980s the towns were full of caravan parks and single men's quarters. Now, families reside permanently throughout the entire region. A great stability has settled on the Pilbara and consolidated the growth of that region. It is no longer a harsh environment which was so often part of the mind-set of the Liberal Party in office.

The reign of Sir Charles Court saw the Pilbara as simply a place where iron ore could be quarried and shipped out. Regard was paid to only the profit companies could derive in the north-west and no regard was paid to the workers and the families who participated in the growth of that region.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: Even you don't believe that.

Hon Mark Nevill: Mr Lockyer typifies that attitude.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: He absolutely typifies the age of the preoccupation with profit making which had no regard for the needs of the people who were participating in the wealth generation of that region.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: You are talking about the bludgers.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Is the member referring to the workers of the north west as bludgers? That is far from the truth and he should be the first to withdraw that statement. I would not be surprised if that was his attitude because it is often reflected in the attitude of his colleagues when they refer to the workers of the north west as bludgers.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not feel like calling for order all night. I am interested in hearing Hon Tom Stephens' version of what has occurred in the Pilbara. I think members should listen to that version.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The record of Pam Buchanan will speak for itself. She will cherish her record and the achievements she has made during her time with the Labor Government in its delivery of benefits for the community. She has retired from Parliament because of ill health. I am sure all members will take the opportunity of wishing her well. My prayers and the prayers of others in the House are with her. I hope she enjoys her retirement with her husband, daughter Jane and other members of her family. I hope she cherishes her good record and enjoys her well-earned retirement.

The retirement of a member, however, produces the need for a by-election. The Government now has the difficult task of winning the seat of Ashburton. It is notoriously difficult for a Government to maintain a seat in a by-election. Previously, that seat has been held with a small margin of votes and in the normal course of events it will be difficult for the Government to win it. When I stood for North Province during a by-election, a 14.5 per cent swing was cast against the Liberal Party. That demonstrates the region is extremely volatile, with great swings occurring against the Government during by-elections. It is by no means a safe Labor seat. It was occupied for a number of years by a Liberal Party member, Brian

Sodeman. Prior to that it was held by narrow margins. Arthur Bickerton was a previous Labor member. He took that seat from my wife's great uncle, the Labor member for Pilbara, Loy Rodoreda. He held that seat with narrow margins for the Labor Party. Loy Rodoreda was a Speaker in the lower House.

Hon P.G. Pental: He was one of the few honourable Labor members.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: He was a great member for the region and I am proud to include him in the litany of saints of my wife's family, if not my own.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: A very nice lady.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I am pleased that the member can recognise talent.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: Unfortunately she can't.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The Pilbara is by no means an area which the Labor Party can safely count as its own, particularly in the face of a by-election. Nonetheless, the Government is faced with the prospect of hanging on to a seat despite the difficulties by-elections bring. We know we have an excellent candidate in the Shire President of the Shire of Roebourne and the Clerk of Courts for that area, Fred Riebeling, and he is working extremely hard to retain that seat for the Labor Party.

Hon George Cash: We understand that Joy West is a good candidate.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I understand she is a very good candidate and that she recently arrived from New Zealand. No doubt she will be able to draw on New Zealand's experience when it comes to the Liberal Party's industrial relations policy and its impact on this State. If she does, she will want quickly to jettison the Liberal Party's industrial relations policy, which has been developed from the New Zealand experience and which has destroyed the social fabric of that nation. If the New Zealand model is one she can learn from she should at least persuade her colleagues not to go down that path of industrial sabotage on which no future can be built for this State. I am sure she is a pleasant woman, but I hope she is able to draw on her experience in another jurisdiction to make sure that the people of this State do not have inflicted on them the horrors of the industrial strategies which have been implemented in New Zealand and are articulated by conservative parties here. I will speak a little later about industrial relations.

Hon George Cash: You tell us that every time and you never get around to it.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: If Hon George Cash will assure me that he will give me an extension of time at the end of my contribution, I will definitely return to that subject.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not tolerate any more interjections or members holding conversations across the Chamber. Members should listen to Hon Tom Stephens.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: A dramatic contrast can be drawn between the industrial relations policies of the two major parties. For instance, in the area of enterprise bargaining the Labor Party only supports workplace bargaining between employers and industry unions when the unions have the skill, the knowledge and expertise to ensure that workers are not exploited in the bargaining process by using the arbitration process available in our system. On the other hand, the Liberal Party supports enterprise bargaining where the laws of the jungle apply. It is opposed to large industry based unions representing workers in the bargaining process. Instead, it prefers creating tame, poorly resourced company unions or, ideally, having individual contracts negotiated for employees. In that way, it is attempting to provide a situation where negotiations over wages would be on unequal terms with the employer without the advantage of bargaining inside the system which is available today.

The Government supports the retention of the Industrial Relations Commission as an independent umpire. It also supports the retention of the commission's power to issue common rule awards and general orders which apply across industries. These awards and general orders provide a safety net for workplace bargaining. For example, we have general orders which prescribe a minimum entitlement both for long service and annual leave. The Liberal Party has refused to explain what role it envisages for the IRC. It proposes to legislate for what it describes as reasonable minimum conditions as some sort of safety net, implying that instead of leaving it to a neutral umpire like the IRC to determine what is reasonable, the Liberal Party will determine what is reasonable. The removal from the IRC

of the setting of minimum conditions can be proposed by the Liberal Party only if it is planning to reduce current standard conditions which have been set by the IRC. Clearly, the Liberal Party envisages the abolition of penalty rates in the retail sector. One has only to look at page 33 of the State Liberal Party's document to establish that fact.

In the training area the Labor Party has continued to support training guarantee levies designed to ensure that employers provide meaningful training for employees. The training levy is part of the Labor Party's strategy to develop a highly skilled and well paid work force which is internationally competitive. On the other hand, the Liberal Party has opposed the training guarantee levy. Dr Hewson, the Federal Leader of the Opposition, has stated that a Federal Liberal Party Government would abolish the levy, and the State Liberal Party has indicated its support for his position. The abolition of the levy appears to be part of the Liberal Party's Third World growth strategy for low skilled, low paid Australian workers to make them nothing more than industrial cannon fodder for Australian industry. As a consequence, the work force of Australia will be left to become the white trash of Asia instead of having the opportunities which will be provided by the training guarantee levy to be skilled, to be competitive and to be able to stand in the international community competing for the jobs available through competitive industry in this country.

Remarkable and dramatic contrasts exist between the policies of both parties in industrial relations, superannuation, the role of unions, workers' compensation and in ensuring that the workers of Western Australia have the opportunity to receive a fair day's wage for a fair day's work.

In the days when the Liberal Party was in office there were, in the context of the Pilbara, excesses on both sides of the industrial relations equation. One of the great tragedies of the Liberal Party in office was for all the work force to see the rorts which developed in the system. Real work practice problems were not being adequately addressed by the Government of the day. Failure in management resulted in excesses in various industries.

Hon Peter Foss interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Hon Peter Foss should be the last person to enter into a debate on industrial relations. His firm has as one of its clients Cliffs Robe River, and for as long as he is associated with that firm we can be sure that he has no right to enter a rational debate on industrial relations.

Withdrawal of Remark

Hon PETER FOSS: Hon Tom Stephens has said two things about me which are incorrect. First, he said I am associated with the firm of Mallesons Stephen Jaques, and I am not. Second, he said that Mallesons Stephen Jaques represents Robe River in matters of industrial law, and it does not.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I will withdraw the claims because I previously understood from a comment Hon Peter Foss made in this Chamber that he had some association with Robe River and in that context I believed he would be the last person to raise his voice on this subject. Is Hon Peter Foss telling me that he has never had any association with Robe River?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Tom Stephens has gone off on a tangent which I was not going to allow him to pursue. I suggest that he return to what he was talking about and that he direct his comments to me and not to Hon Peter Foss.

Debate Resumed

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It was unfortunate. I am now confused. I do not know whether Hon Peter Foss worked for Robe River.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Do not worry about it.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: He may clarify the matter at some point. He may do that before he turns up in the Pilbara on the weekend and has to face the work force at Wickham. Fred Riebeling, the Shire President of Roebourne and Labor candidate for the Pilbara by-election this Saturday, has accurately drawn to the attention of the Ashburton community the potential industrial chaos that could come from the election of a Liberal Government in Western Australia because of the Liberal Party's policy of deregulation and its approach to industrial relations. He rightly claims it would be disastrous for the Pilbara iron ore industry.

In a recent media statement he said that the latest figures released by the iron ore industry consultative council showed that industrial disputation had been in steady decline over the past decade. Mr Riebeling said that the industrial peace created by the consultative council's cooperative approach to industrial relations would be wrecked by the Liberal Party's primitive approach to employer-employee relations. He said that the Pilbara would be plunged back into the dark days of the Court era. Mr Riebeling said that at a Rotary dinner last week in Karratha.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Did you write that for him?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I would love to claim authorship, but cannot do so. It was said in Mr Riebeling's speech to a Rotary dinner at Karratha last week. It was the subsequent source of a media release because he was proud of what he said, no doubt because of the accuracy of it.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Hon Eric Charlton does not have to defend the Liberal Party's period in office in 1983. He had nothing to do with that so he should leave it to Liberal Party members of this House to defend themselves, if they can. Mr Riebeling says that the Liberal Party still appears to believe it could win favour with mining companies and overseas investors by introducing policies aimed at grinding the work force into the ground. It is no surprise to members on this side of the House that even today Sir Charles Court, father of his little son Richard, was flying around the Pilbara in an aircraft allegedly supplied by Robe River. That aircraft has been flying him from town to town. It makes the point to everybody in the Pilbara that the policies of Robe River and the Liberal Party are at one.

I am not sure that that claim is an accurate one. I ask members opposite to check whether the claims relayed by a deep throat in the Liberal Party to members on this side of the House are accurate.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Nothing could more accurately demonstrate the unity of purpose of the Liberal Party to smash the work force in Western Australia in the same way as Robe River has endeavoured to do in the north west. I know that members opposite recently had an opportunity to go to the north west. I am told by a source in the Liberal Party they were offered an opportunity to take a trip to the Pilbara last week. I understand from claims made to us that a charter flight was made available for all Liberal members to fly north during the parliamentary recess if they would like to go and assist the Liberal Party candidate. I understand that the aircraft was supplied by a firm appropriately named "Kreepy Krawley". I am not sure that is the actual name of the aircraft, which is said to belong to a Mr Williams who made that aircraft available to fly Liberal Party members to the north.

One can imagine the trepidation of the people in the north, not least our members, as they wondered who would come up on that aircraft. They envisaged Liberal members coming off "Kreepy Krawley Airlines" to doorknock the Pilbara and shake the fabric of the Labor Party campaign in the north. Members may ask what happened. We understand that the plane winged its way into Karratha, landed and as the door was lowered from the aircraft jaws dropped as out popped only one member of the Liberal Party. Who was it? It is said to have been Charlie Court's little son, Richard. That was apparently the best the Liberal Party could produce when that plane flew north to produce a Liberal Party team to doorknock the north of this State.

Hon Tom Helm: A mass doorknock.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Yes, a mass doorknock.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I go north regularly. No doubt, as soon as I am finished here, I will

go north again. I understand other Liberal Party members will travel to the north soon. I am told Hon Peter Foss will be going north on the weekend.

Hon Peter Foss: Who told you that?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: We have our sources.

Hon Peter Foss: The Premier's department!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I did not know that came from the Premier's department. Did that department tell the people in the Liberal Party who told us what is going on?

Hon P.G. Pandal: It is improper use of Government information, again.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It is similar to the 1977 campaign when the Liberal Party winged its lawyers north to the Kimberley.

Hon P.G. Pandal: To stop you cheating.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: They did that to intimidate the voters of the Kimberley and stop them casting their democratic vote. I understand that yet again another team of Liberal Party lawyers including Hon Peter Foss will be going north in an attempt to intimidate the voters of Ashburton.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Is Hon Peter Foss flying "Kreepy Krawley Airlines"?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want the honourable member to direct all his comments to the Chair otherwise I will stop him talking. I also ask other members to cease their interjections. The fewer times the honourable member is interrupted the quicker he will get to the point.

Hon E.J. Charlton: He seems very excited.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Not at all.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I am sorry, Mr President. The issue of the democratic processes of this State is something with which our party is passionately concerned. This party has always been committed to ensuring that voters have an opportunity to exercise their democratic right and cast their vote. That concern has not been shared by our parliamentary colleagues on the other side of this Chamber.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Rubbish!

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Hon David Wordsworth should be the last to interject because he was the Minister for Lands when the Cabinet drew the line that created the gerrymander in the Pilbara. That gerrymander caused Hon Bill Withers to resign in disgust in 1982, saying it was the worst gerrymander in the western world. Hon David Wordsworth participated, as Minister for Lands, in the Cabinet process which drew the line which caused Bill Withers to resign and resulted in my arrival in this Parliament, for which I am eternally grateful to Hon David Wordsworth. In that context he should not interject because this is a reminder of yet another sordid period in the history of the Liberal Party; a gerrymander that revolted voters of the north west and led to our retaining those seats. It was part of a period of corrupting the electoral process in this State. That resulted in members like a former Speaker in the other place voting against the Government in 1977 when it tried to introduce electoral laws aimed at preventing people voting. In 1978 a Liberal Government set up the Cain inquiry in an attempt - in the end successfully - to convert the electoral laws of this State to make it harder for voters to cast their vote. The Liberal Party did all of that. If it is not ashamed of its history, as it is now a bit old and dating back to 1983, surely it is ashamed of its recent history. In the past couple of weeks Liberal Party members have had the gall to demonstrate their lack of concern for the voters in the Ashburton electorate by objecting to a polling place being positioned out on the Burrup Peninsula to service workers of the Burrup who are required to work from dawn to dusk on that day as part of a shutdown. Members opposite have objected, and in the process of those objections have forced the Electoral Commission not to place a polling booth in close proximity to those workers on polling day so that they

can vote in this by-election. That is the sort of party we are dealing with. It has a consistent history of trying to thwart the wishes of voters in this State, and even in the next few days in the seat of Ashburton that is what it will be doing. The workers at the Burrup Peninsula will have to catch a bus back into Karratha or Dampier from their workplace in order to cast their votes as they are entitled to do. Members of the Liberal Party are the last people on this planet to talk to us about respecting the democratic traditions of this State. Members opposite are the constitutional vandals who should go to their graves in shame for their history, their recent history and their current involvement. They should be ashamed of their present behaviour, as they have participated in trying yet again to thwart voters in Ashburton.

I would hope that members opposite who go north recognise that the electoral laws provide the opportunity for people, whether they are blind or cannot read, to take a how-to-vote card into a polling booth and say to the presiding officer that they want to vote that way. That should be a sufficient instruction, as was determined by Justice Smith in 1977 when he presided over the Court of Disputed Returns, gave his judgment and chucked the Liberal Party member out of office at the end of that Court of Disputed Returns hearing when he determined that the electoral laws of this State meant that a how-to-vote card was a sufficient instruction to a presiding officer at any polling booth of how a voter wishes to vote, whether he is blind or illiterate. It is up to the presiding officer to ask the voter whether that card adequately and accurately reflects that person's voting intention. There is no room for participants, with the fraudulent past that members opposite have, to try to monitor the electoral laws of this State. That is up to the Electoral Commission, which has done a damned good job in trying to keep up with members opposite and in trying to keep up with every last little trick they have had in their books. The Electoral Commission has watched members opposite from 1977 until 1992, and it is up with them. It will not matter whether members opposite send up the famous Queen's Counsel from Perth, Hon Peter Foss. He will have to come back recognising that the Electoral Commission and electoral officials are the ones who have the right and the role in the polling booths of this State to arbitrate over the voting system. There are members who have been embarrassed by the Liberal Party's history in this area - distinguished people such as the former Speaker, Hon Ian Thompson, who was chronically embarrassed in 1977 when he had to vote against the electoral laws being introduced and used his casting vote as Speaker to knock off the corrupting process going on in this State and being proposed by Sir Charles Court. From then until now members opposite have not forgotten their old tricks, and neither has the Electoral Commission.

There is no doubt that the former Premier of this State, Sir Charles Court, will have received a great shock when he went to the Pilbara today to see, in marked contrast to the style of operations in the north when he was Premier, that there is no longer the industrial chaos that was the hallmark of his era in Government. Instead there has been a period of prolonged industrial tranquillity. Indeed, if members care to consider iron ore production, they will find that the Pilbara shipped a record 114 million tonnes last year, an increase of more than 10 per cent on the previous year. Sir Charles is travelling around with the Leader of the Opposition, Hon Barry MacKinnon - who is no doubt keeping an eye on what Sir Charles Court is up to in case there is a leadership challenge from the north, in case the Court forces are able to regroup in the north and come down and take the leadership prize in the south. Sir Charles would be shocked to learn that the number of working days lost through industrial trouble was at a record low last year - 14 600, down from 160 000 in 1982. This figure is even more significant because the industry is much bigger today. Sir Charles Court will find that the Pilbara work force today does not live in the caravans and camps that were typical of his period of office. It comprises families living in modern houses in towns with full social and community infrastructure. Indeed, Sir Charles would be shocked to find in Karratha a commercial centre which was established to replace the monopoly that he facilitated for Farmers Stores in Karratha. Instead Karratha has a modern shopping plaza which has broken the monopoly facilitated by the Liberals when in office, and wonderful shopping facilities with healthy competition and a wide variety of retail businesses.

These are things to which Sir Charles will have difficulty relating, if indeed he is flying around the Ashburton in a Robe River aircraft at this very moment. However, he may be able to relate to the industrial expansion occurring in the Pilbara at the moment, because he will no doubt be enjoying the fact that the Pilbara is charging ahead with resource projects

worth \$4 billion under construction and projects valued at twice that amount in the planning stage. If Sir Charles takes time to speak to families in the Pilbara he will find them extremely optimistic and positive about the region, in marked contrast to the attitude of his erstwhile colleagues.

The Liberal Party sometimes shams concern for the poor in this community. That sham concern for people in poverty is demonstrated most graphically by the commitment of members opposite to the goods and services tax of the Federal Liberal Party - the aspiring Liberal Government - and its Western Australian colleagues. The Fightback package, which tries to argue the case for a goods and services tax, is indeed a sham in so far as it claims to have any concern for people who are poor, or on lower incomes or even middle incomes. In fact, the goods and services tax is nothing but a misappropriation of the resources of the entire community to look after the interests of the wealthy, and in that context the wheels are rapidly falling off the Fightback package, and perhaps have already fallen off. It has become more of a slideback proposal for the people of the Australian community - a slideback into difficult times as they try to grapple with a tax that takes figures of up to \$8 000 from the pay packets of ordinary wage earners in the Pilbara region, for example. These vandals have been prepared to inflict with their policy documents a proposal for a goods and services tax in this country.

The State Liberals are also committed to torpedoing Stateships and removing from this State the opportunities that that service has provided to the people in the north west, particularly in the Kimberley region.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: It loses \$14 million a year.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Is Hon Philip Lockyer opposed to Stateships as well? Does he support the Liberal Party policy?

Hon P.H. Lockyer: Absolutely.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: We have another member from the north west who will be hounded from town to town when he next shows his face in the Pilbara and the Kimberley, because nothing is more vital to those regions than Stateships. The member should speak to his good friend Brian Cole in Kununurra and Wyndham about the difficulties that policy will cause for his own Liberal Party colleagues as they try to sustain a business in the north aimed at the distribution of goods and services to the people of the Kimberley in such a way as to be able to match prices to meet the capacity to pay of the people living in that area. If one were to remove that Stateships service, or prevent the reintroduction of Stateships to the Pilbara, one would rob the people of that region of the opportunities of obtaining services and supplies such as food, clothing and construction items at a reasonable price. I am stunned that a member representing the Mining and Pastoral Region, who claims to have a commitment to the people of that area, should support such a destructive policy of abolishing the Stateships service to the north of this State. But, I suppose that nothing should surprise me.

The people of the north west will be adversely affected by a number of aspects of a goods and services tax.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: What about the policy released yesterday containing lies?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: My colleague in the Pilbara, Mr Fred Riebeling, was trying to add up what the goods and services tax would mean to the region. A whole range of my colleagues, and their staff, every now and again turn to the Federal Liberal Party policy document to try to determine what it will mean for the area. It is very confusing. Many people decided to try the Fightback hotline in an attempt to make sense of the package - the number can be found on the Fightback booklet. On ringing the number and asking for the detail of the matter, one finds that the person on the other end of the line provides confused answers. No wonder others have trouble. When people involved with the package cannot get it right, what chance do we have? On ringing the hotline and asking a straight question about the application of GST to rent -

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not call for order again. I suggest to members who have been interjecting that I will take some action to draw the House's attention to the fact that they are defying the Chair, and I will leave it to the House to take the appropriate moves to remove those members from this place so we can continue listening to Hon Tom Stephens.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: When the public ring the hotline, they receive confused information. On asking whether GST will apply to rent, "yes" was the answer given. However, when one puts this information into a calculation, and once this is printed, one discovers that qualifications apply. One is told that GST does not apply to all rentals. We were told that it will apply to commercial rents, but apparently it will not apply to all rents. I hope the Liberal Party will get this right, but the hotline does not clear up whether GST will apply to all service and rental fees. Apparently the GST will not apply to fixed residential tenancies, but that appears to be the only area of exemption. This information was unearthed only after a massive amount of cross-checking. However, complaints were made in the other place because we produced figures on the basis of the inquiries made to the GST hotline, which provided misleading information. Nevertheless, we are accused of misleading the community. How can other people understand this policy if the Liberal Party does not understand it? Certainly, the Fightback hotline does not understand it, and we made a mistake in trying to unravel the Opposition's proposed goods and services tax.

We discovered that shire rates would increase in an average household following the application of the GST from \$900 to \$1 035; the average electricity bill of \$6 000 would increase to \$6 900, which by itself would produce a massive increase in the cost of living for the people of the north; an average food bill of \$400 a week presently - which is not extraordinary in these areas - would increase annually from \$20 800 to \$22 880; the education, clothes, entertainment, fuel and others category will increase from \$7 800 to \$8 970; and air fares, which people in the north west need to take holidays away from the hot climate, will increase from \$1 500 to \$1 725. That is the case if persons choose to holiday within the State; however, if they choose to desert the State and holiday in Bali it will be much cheaper. That can hardly be good for the State. The GST is promoting holidays in Bali, yet if one wants to holiday within the north west region or to travel down to Mandurah to enjoy the tourist benefits the State has to offer, the GST will apply. Therefore, GST spells bad news for the people of the north west, and they know it!

Liberal Party documents released during the Ashburton by-election campaign contain some interesting references. A document from the Liberal Party candidate contains a reference to access to health care and states that "health care facilities are first class in the region". It is good to see that we receive credit that is due, because health care facilities in the region are indeed first class, and we welcome that recognition.

People complain that this Government has yet to deliver downstream processing to this State, particularly in the Pilbara; however, the truth is that it has taken a sustained period of good industrial relations to instil confidence in the business community of the world to take the opportunity of coming to the Pilbara to develop business opportunities. These companies are recognising that we have stable industrial relations with a productive work force, and that solid record has been established during the past nine years. We now have the opportunity of moving to the next stage of development in the Pilbara through downstream processing of our resources. We have sorted out the industrial chaos left by our predecessors in this State. We now face the challenge of reducing energy charges, which will produce a favourable climate for downstream processing and utilising the energy resources of the Pilbara.

We now have a solid foundation on which the people of the Pilbara can move to a bright future. These people are canny and they understand the benefits which can accrue from the stabilising period of good industrial relations and a productive work force which can participate in the next growth period in the Pilbara region. Nothing could bring more damage to the people of that region than slipping back to the bad old days, when, under Sir Charles Court, industrial chaos existed in that area. In those days it was possible to go around the world selling our product because people wanted to steal iron ore from us. However, in the harder economic climate we face today it has been necessary to take certain action to sell our produce, and we now have a solid record of good industrial relations in the Pilbara.

A fallacious reference made earlier in this debate to the employment record of this Government. In the nine years that we have been in office 180 000 jobs have been created.

Hon P.H. Lockyer interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: We can take delight in that figure.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Sometimes I cannot hear myself speak, Mr President, due to the interjections from members opposite.

Hon P.G. Pendal: You are fortunate.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not know how long Hon Phil Lockyer thinks I will tolerate his blatant defiance of my earlier comments. I warn him for the first time; my next reference to him will be the last. On some occasions members may not like what other members say in this place. They do not have to believe what the other member says, but they do have to listen to what others say. I suggest they do so.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: This amounts to employment growth of 31.6 per cent. Australia-wide employment growth was only 22.5 per cent in the same period. Current projections by both the Government and independent economic analysts suggest that this strong employment performance will continue through the 1990s. One hundred thousand new jobs are expected to be created over the next four years. The National Institute of Economic and Industry Research predicts an employment growth of 223 000 by the year 2000. Unemployment will halve according to the same predictions. Unemployment fell to 5.4 per cent in 1989; that is, half its current rate, despite strong increases to labour force participation. The projected employment performance over the next two years is one of having unemployment return to those low levels.

The opportunity of creating more jobs in this State cannot be turned away when nothing is more important to this Government than creating jobs for people who do not have them. Unfortunately, high levels of unemployment exist despite the creation of those new jobs of which the Government is proud. Therefore, more new jobs must be created. The people of Ashburton and Pilbara need the opportunity of continuing in the direction of solid economic growth based on a productive work force and good industrial relations in that region. They must be able to create more jobs for the community of Western Australia. If they are provided with that opportunity, which will be delivered by a Labor Party in office with the participation of colleagues as committed to that process as Fred Riebeling, the Australian Labor Party candidate for Ashburton, we can be sure that the Pilbara, like the rest of the State, has a great opportunity of prospering beyond the 1990s into the next century.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Fred McKenzie.

ACTS AMENDMENT (GAME BIRDS PROTECTION) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 19 March.

HON P.G. PENDAL (South Metropolitan) [8.22 pm]: Members may be aware that the reasons for the Government's moving a second time in 18 months on this matter are not to be found in the second reading speech given by the Minister for Police in this House 10 days ago. The Opposition here and elsewhere respects the views and aspirations of those people outside the Parliament who are advocates of this Bill. The fact is, however, that we do not share their views or for that matter their aspirations. If the reasons stated in the Minister's second reading speech were a valid expression of the Labor Party's view, we would have seen a Bill of this kind introduced into the Parliament in 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989. My point is, of course, that if the Government were serious and as dedicated to this cause as it makes out to decent people outside the Parliament, we could reasonably have expected the Bill to arrive in the Parliament some time in the first seven years of the Government's term in office. That was not the case. The Government was in office for eight long - and to us weary - years before it was prepared to take the action that it now says is so desperately needed for the people of this State.

Hon John Halden: For many years we did not declare a season; be fair. That is outrageous.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is not the Labor Party's stance.

Hon John Halden: How would you know?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Because I have read its policy. The Labor Party's stance is to introduce

a Bill of the kind that is now before the House. My point remains that it took the Labor Party seven or eight years to express its belief in legislative form. Why was that? I will describe at least three reasons that, for its first eight years in Government, the Labor Party could not bring itself to respond to its policy commitments. Implicit in that description will be a suggestion that the Labor Party is not dinkum on this issue; that in a cynical way it is using people outside the Parliament who are conscientious in their views. This Government sees in this Bill a chance to divert attention from a rash of difficulties which confront it.

The first reason that we did not see a Bill of this kind for the first eight years of the Government's term was that there are deep seated divisions within the Government's ranks over a Bill of this kind. The Premier herself has miraculously turned from a position of support for duck shooting to one of opposition. I suggest that she has become a captive of those people in the Labor Party who see in this legislation the chance to use well meaning people outside the Parliament despite the fact that they do not share their views. There were other people, of course. We know that Hon Jim Brown supported the Opposition's stance and that the Deputy Premier supports the Opposition. We also know that someone in the Government's ranks who was dragooned into supporting this goes goat shooting. We know, therefore, that this Bill has nothing to do with the conservation values of this State. It has everything to do with grasping at straws to get the Government out of a political dilemma in which it has found itself.

The second reason we did not see this Bill before the House during those first eight years was that the political imperative did not exist to bring it here. We know, for example, that only when the Government went into a crisis mode, when everything else started to become unravelled by its outrageous and improper behaviour in a range of other areas did it decide to seek out half a dozen emotional and emotive issues which might put some distance between it and those issues which reflected badly on its reputation. This Bill was taken off the shelf, dusted down and presented to the Labor Caucus with the plea that members should wholeheartedly support it because it was the possible salvation of a Government in so much trouble on other serious issues. Many people in our community would back the assertion that the genuine people in the conservation movement who have strong feelings about these matters - I know because I have been at the receiving end of them - are being used by this Government for reasons that are entirely unconnected with duck shooting.

A Bill was brought into this House in 1990 because of the heat and pressure that was turned on over the Government's outrageous business activities, and we know its fate. Where was the Bill in the 1991 parliamentary session? Would members not think that a Government that was committed to conservation values of this kind would have taken the matter seriously enough to have a second go at the earliest opportunity? The Government decided that it was not at that stage one of the diversions that it wanted to introduce into Parliament and use cynically as it had used other issues, because members opposite were by no means unanimous on the matter.

The Opposition makes no apology for saying that it takes a different view on this matter to that taken by the Labor Party.

Hon T.G. Butler: Are you going to give us that view?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Yes, I am. It is a view that I have expressed before in this House and elsewhere in the public arena and it is a view which we have held consistently and which is now the subject of a Bill the title of which I advised the House today and which will be debated in this place later in the week. I make no apology either for directing my remarks to my colleague, Hon Reg Davies, in the hope that he will give the contents of that Bill the scrutiny they deserve. Then, hopefully, he will give it the support that it deserves because, by any yardstick, the moves that the Opposition will outline shortly take into account the genuine conservation values that are at stake. I will tell the House about some of the Government's cynical exercises in a moment.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am finding it difficult not to come to the conclusion that the member is anticipating debate on a Bill that is not currently before the Chair. I suggest that that is out of order and, if that is the path he is embarking on, he should get off it.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Instead, I will remind the House of the Liberal Party's policy on duck shooting. What happens after that is a matter with which the House will deal at the appropriate time.

I make no apology for saying that we reject any element in the Bill which expresses those animal liberation values that have become too easily confused with the genuine conservation values which are at stake. Anyone who has even a rudimentary knowledge of the subject with which we are confronted knows that all genuine conservationists in Western Australia and elsewhere see as the most serious matter confronting wildlife the state of the wetlands in Western Australia. The state of those habitats is something that is even more fundamental than the bird population issue.

Hon Mark Nevill: And you want to poison them with lead.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The member should not anticipate me, because he gives me new material each time that he does. If members accept the advice of those genuine conservationists that what is really at stake is the state of the wetlands system that supports all of that bird life, on that score alone this Government stands condemned.

Hon John Halden: I hope you can justify that.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Until the Opposition brought pressure to bear on this Government to take action on an inventory of wetlands in Western Australia in 1990, nothing had been done by the Government.

Hon Mark Nevill: What about System 6?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: System 6 goes back to years before the Labor Government took office and, therefore, the member should not introduce that as another diversionary tactic. Only when the Liberal Opposition raised a serious environmental question in 1990 about the state of Western Australia's wetlands was this Government forced into a rather hurried version of an inventory of WA's wetlands. Members will be aware that, because the Government acted hurriedly, it, like anyone who acts in a hurry, got itself into trouble. It relied, for example, on outdated satellite imagery that led it to believe that it was declaring wetlands that had disappeared 30 years before and had become football fields.

Hon Mark Nevill: Satellite imagery was not available 30 years ago, you donkey.

Withdrawal of Remark

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is out of order to refer to a member in that way. I suggest the member withdraw it.

Hon MARK NEVILL: I withdraw that remark, Mr President.

Debate Resumed

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That was the beginning of a serious debate about the state of the wetlands and habitats in Western Australia. The Government wanted to arrive at the destination without paying the train fare. That is typical of many of its actions in recent years. It could not arrive at the destination of a proper inventory or of an inventory that gave it some understanding of the quality of those wetlands unless it was prepared to pay for people to go into the field. Therefore, it had to rely on some inaccurate satellite imagery. What did the Government do? After it was forced into doing something in December last year by the Opposition - it was then that the Opposition announced that there was a need for that inventory - and so desperate was it to get runs on the board with the Conservation Council of Western Australia, many members of which regard the Government with contempt because of its double standards, it forced every staff member of the Environmental Protection Authority whether or not qualified in wetland surveys, and other scientists who knew nothing about the subject, to do a job which the Government was not prepared to pay to have done.

Hon John Halden interjected.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Had the member listened, he would know that I advanced from the point where the satellite imagery was not doing the job for the Government because it was found out. It advanced to the point in December 1991 at which all EPA staff took part in the wetlands surveys, whether or not they were qualified to do so. My criticism is not directed towards the EPA staff, many of whom did not want to take part in the surveys because they were not competent to do so, but towards the political imperative that drove the Government to say that it wanted people to take part in the wetlands survey whether or not they had the qualifications and expertise to do so. I referred earlier to the Liberal Party's response on this

matter for the past 20 months. Its response has not been either to the duck shooters or to the conservationists. Its response has not merely been to oppose the Bill, but has been a measured and scientifically based response that puts at the centre of this debate the future of the State and the quality and quantity of the wetlands.

Hon T.G. Butler: What a lot of rubbish.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I will tell Hon Tom Butler what the policy is based on. Firstly, the Liberal Party takes the view that those wetlands should have been surveyed long before this, in order to arrive at a position where we could say that no duck hunting would take place on nature reserves of high conservation value. In other words, one would begin to grade those reserves across Western Australia and make a decision as to whether some reserves would be kept exclusively because of their high conservation value. Some would then be classified as acceptable for duck shooting; that is, provided one was not driven by the animal liberation argument which takes this Government down that road. Secondly, the Opposition took the view that there should be, for example, an increase in the licence fees levied against duck shooters. That is based on the principle that even this Government has come to accept, that the user pays. Those extra funds would be matched by the Government of the day - which the Opposition is prepared to do - and then paid into a wetlands preservation fund. That would take us into a quantum leap. I repeat my earlier assertion that the Government has been quite unwilling to commit real funds to the preservation of those habitats. That is the second part of the Opposition's proposals for the past 20 months. I admit it was not done with the support of all conservationists, some of whom we will never satisfy, but it was with the support of those who know that habitats are at the heart and soul of the matter. The Opposition computes that, given the number of duck shooters in Western Australia, with those increased fees over a five year period they would be contributing, together with the matching Government funds, approximately \$500 000 towards wetlands preservation and enhancement. The Government has been unable to come to terms with that.

The third part of the Liberal Party policy - I hope that Hon Tom Butler, who was denigrating it earlier, is listening carefully - is the belief that the Government should have introduced a long time ago a water fowl identification test. It would then have been reasonable to demand that people taking part in the perfectly legitimate activity of duck shooting should know - as most of them do - the difference between those water fowl that are on the rare and endangered list and those of a common variety that can be taken for their purpose. It is interesting that that water fowl identification test was this month adopted by the New South Wales Government with the support of the Labor Party in that State - this Government's colleagues. Also, all of the policy I am describing has been consistently upheld by the Victorian State Labor Government. The Opposition in this State is not out of step on the matter; members opposite and their colleagues in other States, including Queensland, Tasmania, South Australia, New South Wales and the Northern Territory, are out of step.

I hope that the members of this House will take some time to check the international status of this argument. I was in America recently, and learnt that the biggest contributor to wetlands preservation in the United States is an organisation called Ducks Unlimited, which donates \$65 million a year. That body is something of a fraternal organisation to the duck shooting groups in Australia. A country of that size can see what the seemingly blind members of the Labor Party in this State do not see; that is, the relationship between protecting wildlife habitats and allowing shooting in those areas under conditions with which everyone is satisfied.

The fourth and final part of the Liberal policy, that has been consistent in the last couple of years, relates to the valid concern about the use of lead shot in duck hunting. Twenty months ago the Liberal Party took the position that should sufficient scientific evidence be adduced which pointed to wetlands deterioration and pollution because of lead shot, it would introduce a ban on lead shot. However, the Liberal Party did it in a way that would have been consistent with this Government's social engineering. For example, when the Government introduced bans on the advertising of tobacco products it did not introduce sudden death legislation; it allowed some of those people who would be terribly inconvenienced and perhaps put out of work time to adjust. That was the Liberal Party's stance on the use of lead shot. For example, it respected the rights of private property and the gun owners, many of whom may have invested large sums of money in guns that used only lead shot. We did not say that as from the following week they would not be able to use

those guns and their investment would be worthless. We thought there should be a changeover period but that if scientific evidence were available indicating that lead shot would cause difficulties, it should be banned. I have certainly seen enough evidence to indicate that, in the long haul, lead shot should be banned from our wetlands. In the next couple of days, that will re-emerge in another form and in a form to which the President, correctly, would not let me allude now. In the meantime, I ask all members on this side of the House, and in particular my colleague Hon Reg Davies, to take at least some time to consider the options that the Liberal Party is putting forward which will go most of the way - it means that the duck shooters will make most of the concessions - towards satisfying two perfectly reasonable groups of people in this State: The duck hunters, and the conservationists who oppose them.

It is worth my reminding members in the context of this debate, and it is certainly worth my reminding members of the public who happen to be listening and who are being painted a picture that the Government is committed to any move that would stop the killing of wildlife in this State, that it is a supreme irony to me that less than a year ago the Opposition found the Government out in trying to sneak through this Parliament amendments to the Health Act that would have allowed native possum to be taken in Western Australia, slaughtered in Western Australia and put on the menu of the Parliament House dining room or any restaurant around town, or into domestic premises around the State. How could members opposite have allowed through their party room an amendment to the Health Act that would make them the sponsors of a Bill to allow taking native possum and killing it in a way that was not related to the taking of duck for people's tables? There seems to me to be an extraordinary degree of hypocrisy in that move. The proof of the pudding was in the eating, and it was only when the Government was found out that it deleted from that health amendment Bill the word "possum". At the time, the Government said, "It is nothing to do with you, Mr Pendal. We are not doing it because you have embarrassed us. We are talking about imported possum." However, the possum was still dead. It still had the same effect. I would have thought that people who were concerned about those issues would be just as concerned about whether they were eating a slaughtered Tasmanian possum as they would be about whether that possum was taken in the wild from Western Australia's own stock. It was only when the hypocrisy was discovered and the embarrassment occurred that the Labor Party agreed in the other place to quickly delete from the Bill the reference to possum. Ironically it left in the Bill - for those who are not aware of it - other classes of native animals that were allowed to be slaughtered under the Health Act and used for human consumption. Those classes of animals are listed in the Bill that passed through the Parliament last year. I put this genuine question to the decent minded conservationists around the place: Why did they not pursue the Government for all its political worth when that piece of jiggery pokery was found out?

I turn now to what is an equally disturbing element to this debate; namely, the need to determine from Government members what is the rush. Why the indecent haste that brings this Bill to the top of the Notice Paper on the third or fourth sitting day of the new parliamentary session? I do not want in any way to denigrate the views of people in the conservation movement who feel strongly about this issue, but I believe that if any matters should be given priority in this session they should be the welfare of people and people's capacity to get work and to fend for themselves. I would have thought that would be at the top of the Government's legislative agenda, but that is not the case.

Hon Mark Nevill: When would be the appropriate time?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I am coming to that. What motivated the Government to do what it is now doing? People are entitled to come to their own conclusion, but I believe that this is part of a quite improper attempt by the Government to intervene in a case that is now before the Supreme Court of Western Australia. That then becomes the real obscenity in what we are being asked to do. If people who are anti-duck shooting feel that that action is an obscenity, I ask them to consider also the fact that what the Government is seeking to do to ambush the Supreme Court is an equal obscenity. Mr Deputy President, I ask you and other members the question: Why is there the need to pre-empt the Supreme Court before 13 April when the Full Court of the Supreme Court will be dealing with one of these matters and when a second matter will be dealt with subsequently? Why is there a need for the Government to cut across the bows of people who have taken perfectly legitimate legal action in the law courts

of this State? I suggest that that interference warrants the most serious alarm on the part of all Western Australians. It is an abuse of the court system and of the legislative processes of this place.

If the Government were really concerned about the preservation of wildlife in this State, it would have done years ago what I suggested earlier; namely, create a comprehensive wetlands plan. It would not have had to resort to using non-qualified Environmental Protection Authority officers in December 1991 to carry out what is turning out to be an unsatisfactory survey anyway. If the Government were serious about the preservation of wildlife, why did it not act on the greatest threat of all; namely, that posed by feral animals? At least the Government is able, through its regulatory agencies, to restrict and control the conduct of the small percentage of duck shooters who never obey any laws, because, as with most laws, we do not have to worry about the majority of duck hunters because they act responsibly. Why has there been all this focus on the human elements and on the alleged and much overrated despoliation that is going on at the hands of shooters when the Government has done nothing to deal with the problem of feral cats, foxes and goats?

Hon Mark Nevill: That is rubbish.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Hon Mark Nevill can talk to anyone in the field, who will tell him that that is where the threat to our native flora and fauna is coming from.

Hon Reg Davies: Let us kill them and stop killing the ducks.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The idea appeals to me. I said to a group at Gidgegannup months ago that maybe while starting to sort out the artificial fight between the Government and duck shooters the Government could do worse than call the duck shooters' association and ask it to become involved in a voluntary way in some of the culls of feral animals across Western Australia. However, I do not believe duck shooters should be asked to do that if it means on the other hand that we will take away the right that has existed for mankind since the dawn of time - even before we had guns with which to take native water fowl.

Hon Reg Davies: The right to smoke has been taken away.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It was taken away without my consent, and I still see Hon Reg Davies puffing around the place.

I put to the House seriously that that is what is devastating the landscape and making such a dreadful impact. Metropolitan Perth people who own domestic cats are causing more damage to the wildlife of the metropolis at least than anyone who is associated with duck hunting. I repeat that for the small percentage of people involved in duck hunting who do not obey the rules let us enforce the rules against them, but let us not penalise the majority if the majority operate responsibly. Are we to be confronted with a ban against kangaroo hunting next? Maybe by way of orderly interjection someone might indicate whether that is the next part of the Government's agenda, because I believe that after banning the advertising of tobacco products the next item on the agenda would be the banning of alcohol products - and that is now being talked about. Why stop there? Why do we not ban the sale of salt products because they cause health problems?

Hon Mark Nevill: Why not ban the sale of condoms? You would support that!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Is it not the case that we should be worrying in this place to modify the worst elements of human behaviour, not preventing or restricting the best elements?

Hon John Halden: Is duck shooting one of the best elements?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I have a question for the member: Is it the Government's intention to move next against the kangaroo shooting industry?

Hon John Halden: No.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Why is it that the Government is not prepared to move against the kangaroo shooting industry? As far as I am aware kangaroos are native to this State.

Hon Peter Foss: They feel pain and they bleed.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Exactly. Some time ago I asked, if the Government can ban duck hunting, why stop there? Why not next tackle a ban on fishing? When fish are taken from the water they feel pain. Why does the Government have a preoccupation with ducks? Why

can I not receive a straight answer about kangaroos? Is it possible that the kangaroo shooting lobby has more political clout with the ALP Government? I see that appeals to my friend, Hon Tom Helm. I think that in his electorate that might be closer to the truth than other members might feel.

The Opposition will not support this Bill. We have not changed our minds since one cynical Bill was introduced in 1990 and another cynical Bill was introduced in 1992. I appeal to members opposite and to the fair minded people in the conservation movement to put the focus where it ought to be. They should place their focus on the state of our wetlands. They should work with the Liberal Party and the duck shooters who are happy to go along with the further restriction. I am not so sure they are happy, but they are prepared to cop it provided they can keep available to them the activity which has been available to mankind ever since the invention of guns. I repeat my plea to Hon Reg Davies to take away our proposition which will crop up in the next day or so, and seriously consider it. My plea is that we do not interfere with a duly commenced legal action which is currently before the Full Court of the Supreme Court. Now that the Attorney General has returned to the Chamber, can he tell us what difference there is in this interference in the case currently before the Supreme Court? What would dissuade the Government from going down the path of moving to legislate other cases out of the Supreme Court? If, for example, some colleagues found their way into the Supreme Court because of the WA Inc matters, why would the Government not intervene on their behalf?

Hon J.M. Berinson: What sort of absurd analogy is that? We are dealing with Government policies.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Attorney General is the first law officer of this State. He has been party to an utterly stupid and quite improper intervention in the Full Court of the Supreme Court of this State.

Point of Order

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The words "stupid" and "improper" when referring to the Attorney General are outside the provisions of Standing Order No 97.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon D.J. Wordsworth): The member did not refer to the Attorney General as being that. That is a different matter.

Debate Resumed

Hon P.G. PENDAL: So that the member does not have a coronary on the spot, I will put it another way but with equal force: The Government has acted improperly in doing what it is doing; why not let the Supreme Court case go through?

Hon J.M. Berinson: Will the member hear me for one moment? Say the court brought down a decision tomorrow; is the member saying that Parliament is incapable on the very next day of legislating to reverse it?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is not what is happening. The Government is seeking -

Hon J.M. Berinson: Why should the Government policy be paralysed by the fact of legal proceedings?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: By the fact that someone is using the duly constituted processes of the courts to achieve those ends. Why should the Government be frustrated and allow those people's action to be discontinued because of the Government's political agenda? That is what it amounts to. The longer Hon Joe Berinson stays in the role of Attorney General the less respect he will receive from the legal profession and the community at large. The Attorney General used to be someone for whom people had regard, but he sits opposite and allows other people in Government to walk over him like a doormat. He could get up on his hind legs and say, "Hang on, these people started the proceedings before the Supreme Court; at least let the processes of the law be carried out."

Hon J.M. Berinson: But for what purpose, if Parliament has a contrary view?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It does not interfere with the Attorney General's capacity, after the Supreme Court has made a decision. The court may even give a decision in his favour.

Hon J.M. Berinson: But what point would be served by having the parties and the court

devote their time and costs to an issue which the Parliament will subsequently reverse - if that is the view of the Parliament?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It would serve the purpose of allowing people to believe that they can take legal action in this State without their rights being pre-empted and legislated away because of the Attorney General's rotten little political agenda.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You could not possibly be suggesting that the people taking this action have been taken by surprise by this legislation?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The first these people and this Parliament knew about the legislation was on 17 March this year when the Governor sat in the President's Chair and said that one of the great priorities of this Government would be the abolition of duck shooting. Their case was in the court long before the Government wrote the Governor's Speech.

Hon J.M. Berinson: An identical Bill was in the Parliament long before that.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Hon Joe Berinson can twist and turn however he likes, but what guarantee is there that when he uses this Bill against a particular group because he does not like the colour of their eyes this time, he will not use the same provisions and tactics to protect himself and other Ministers who might find themselves in the Supreme Court in due course?

Hon J.M. Berinson: Are you suggesting that the Parliament would support a measure like that?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: We in the Liberal Party certainly would not, but I would not put it past the Attorney's Government.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Then why do you ask such a stupid question?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is not stupid.

Hon George Cash: It is not often that an Attorney General tries to undermine the judicial system in Western Australia.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is what Hon Joe Berinson is doing and he knows it. The Attorney General's body language always gives him away.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Another body language man.

Hon Mark Nevill: How about a bit of substance?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Can the Attorney General seriously defend the position that any individual or community group taking some form of legal action, a process that clearly exists at the moment, can have their rights legislated out of existence half way through the process? It is certainly not illegal, but it is immoral.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You are entirely ignoring the history of this issue.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: No-one can have any faith in a Government that does that.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You are ignoring the history to suit your own purposes. You are absolutely wrong and your analogies are pitiful. Why don't you stick to the merits of the Bill? Are you in favour of the Bill or not?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The merits of the Bill count for nothing if the rights of more than half the people in this argument before the Full Court of the Supreme Court will be rubbed out because the Attorney General wants to pass this Bill by 13 April and a few other subsequent dates. It is no good the Attorney General sitting there and rolling his eyes and wondering what I mean about that; he knows exactly what I mean.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Are you saying that you will support this Bill as long as it is held over beyond the decision of the court?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I am not saying that. In Mr Berinson's old age I think he is having a bit of trouble cottoning on to a couple of basic points that I am making.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I think that in his youth Hon Phillip Pendal is trying to avoid the issue.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I will spell out - because the Attorney General was out of the Chamber - one of the basic points the Opposition is making: The Opposition will not support the Bill.

Hon Mark Nevill: You are having two bob each way.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Bill is an insult not only to duck shooters but also to conservationists, who know it is a cynical attempt to go down the path -

Hon J.M. Berinson: Are you saying that the conservationists oppose the Bill the same as you do?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I want to finish my speech and not be interrupted by someone who has only bothered to turn up in the last five minutes of the debate and who is clearly embarrassed, as the first law officer of the State, that his party is taking away people's rights half way through the game.

Hon Mark Nevill: He has not missed anything.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I would not have minded if the Attorney General had had the decency and political courage to bring in this Bill again last year; then it would not have put people in a situation where they had some false hope that they could get a fair hearing from the Full Court. Right now, if the Attorney General had his way, they would have no chance of getting a fair hearing because they would not be able to appear in the Full Court again. That is immoral. When some student of political history comes along in five, 10 or 20 years this will be just another chapter to write on the Attorney General.

I ask that Hon Reg Davies seriously takes into account what the Liberal Party has said on its policy position, which I understand the National Party can support, and which ultimately and within a few days will be expressed in legislative terms. While I have the utmost respect for people in the conservation movement and even those not in the conservation movement who genuinely believe we should ban duck shooting, I do not share those views. I ask that the House not support the Bill but seriously consider the Liberal alternative. Above all I ask the House not to allow the Government to go down once again an utterly immoral path where people's rights are taken away once the game is under way. That is something that the Attorney General should be ashamed of and that the House should be ashamed to be asked to be a party to. In those circumstances I ask members to give this Government what it deserves in this and most other conservation matters; that is, the retribution of the people of this State, not their support. I ask that the Bill be defeated.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Reg Davies.

House adjourned at 9.18 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
SCHOOLS - WAROONA DISTRICT HIGH
Manual Arts Centre Upgrade

9. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Education :

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the outdated and unsatisfactory condition of the manual arts centre at the Waroona District High School?
- (2) When will funds be made available to upgrade the facility to an acceptable standard?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(2)

The manual arts facilities at Waroona District High School consist of a woodwork/metalwork room and an adjacent industrial workshop. While the woodwork/metalwork accommodation is satisfactory, an upgrade of the industrial workshop is being considered, along with other priorities, in the 1992-93 capital works program.

"MEMORIES OF THE BOND STORE" RESTAURANT, BUNBURY - OFFICIAL
OPENING, 14 FEBRUARY 1992
South West Development Authority Funding

10. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Police representing the Minister for South-West:

Was any funding or other form of assistance provided, by either the South West Development Authority or the Minister's office, towards the official opening of the "Memories of the Bond Store" restaurant in Bunbury on Friday, 14 February 1992?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for South-West has provided the following reply -

The Memories of the Bond Store restaurant is situated in a century-old building originally owned by Her Majesty's Customs and then by Westrail, which was destined for demolition when the railway marshalling yards were removed from the City of Bunbury by this Government in 1987. However, through the placing of a special caveat on the building and the land, the building was preserved through a number of changes of ownership, always with the aim that it would be restored and operated as a commercial enterprise. This was done by SWDA at the urging of the local member Phil Smith and supported by the respective Ministers for South-West, Julian Grill and David Smith. That aim came to fruition last year when the Linaker family and the Ashbolt family combined to redevelop the building as a restaurant.

The official opening of the restaurant was the initiative of the proprietor, who invited the Premier to officially declare the premises open. Because of his previous involvement in facilitating the preservation of the building, the Minister for South-West was asked to assist with the invitations by nominating 12 people from the community and SWDA to be invited on the basis of their involvement in the preservation of the building. The proprietor of the restaurant met all costs. The SWDA provided no funding to the function. A public address system was provided at no charge for the function to facilitate speeches by the Premier, the Minister for South-West and the Mayor of Bunbury. Name tags were also provided for some of the guests.

COUNTRY PLANNING COUNCIL - MEMBERSHIP
Role

12. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Planning:

What is the role, and current membership, of the Country Planning Council?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Planning has provided the following reply -

The role of the Country Planning Council is established in Statute - section 22 State Planning Commission Act - viz -

- (a) to make recommendations to the (State Planning) Commission on appropriate policies and procedures for land use planning and land development in country areas;
- (b) to advise the (State Planning) Commission on any aspect of land use planning or land development in country areas which has significance for any region referred to in Schedule 1; and
- (c) to undertake, or cause to be undertaken, and to encourage research into, and studies of, land use planning and land development in country areas.

The current membership of the council comprises -

State Planning Commission associate member - Clr R.W. Maslen - Chairman

State Planning Commission Chairman - S.P. Willmott

Representatives from State Government agencies -

Environmental Protection Authority
Department of Land Administration
Department of Agriculture
Water Authority of Western Australia
Department of State Development
Department of Mines

Consultant to the Government on environmental matters - Dr M. Mulcahy.

LAND - GRAZING LEASES 279 AND 295, BROOME AREA

New Lease Agreement

13. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Were the conditions of grazing leases 279 and 295 (194 hectares near Broome) recently changed?
- (2) Why was the original lease agreement 3116/08074 changed to 3116/10737?
- (3) Has the Department of Land Administration offered the lessee (Mr Reginald Cook) a 21 year lease with no restrictions on dwellings?
- (4) If yes to (3), why were the restrictions on numbers of dwellings lifted?
- (5) Are other grazing leases with similar conditions available to other people in the Broome area?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Lands has provided the following reply -

- (1) Yes. A new lease over Dampier locations 279 and 295 commenced on 1 January 1991 for the purpose of "grazing". Given that the superseded lease - see (2) below - commenced in January 1981, the terms and conditions applicable to the new lease have been varied to reflect present day standard conditions of leasing.
- (2) Former special lease 3116/8074 held by R.D. Crook for the purpose of "grazing" expired on 31 December 1990. Special lease 3116/10737 commenced on 1 January 1991 to replace the former lease.
- (3) The conditions applicable to the new lease are consistent with the previous lease, there being no specific reference to dwellings in either

lease. It was suggested initially that a new clause be inserted preventing any new dwellings other than a manager/caretaker residence but it was objected to on the basis that there is already another residence on the area.

- (4) Family dwellings already exist within location 295 of the new lease and approval for construction of additional dwellings would not be given. The previous lease did not specifically permit or deny the erection of dwellings. Buildings in the lease area are subject to local authority approval.
- (5) Any application for a grazing lease in the Broome area would be considered on its merits, and depending on the availability of suitable land, conditions similar to Mr Crook's lease would be applied.

**KOOMBANA CARAVAN SITE, BUNBURY - TOWN PLANNING SCHEME No 6,
AMENDMENT No 129**

Planned Rezoning - Freeholding of Land Inclusion

14. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Lands:
 - (1) Does the planned rezoning of the Koombana caravan site in Bunbury to "Special Use Site - Resort Facilities" (Town Planning Scheme No 6 - Amendment No 129), include freeholding any part of the land?
 - (2) If yes, how will provision be made for a conservation area with public access along the water's edge, as agreed to by the Bunbury City Council, South West Development Authority and Leschenault Inlet Management Authority, be provided when the site is developed?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Lands has provided the following reply -

- (1) The planned rezoning has no effect on the tenure of the land but it is intended to freehold an area of about 1.8 hectares.
- (2) The 50 metre reserve along the foreshore from the power boat club to the large conservation reserve to the east has been established as part of the rezoning. This area was never intended to be and will not be leasehold. It was originally to be a reserve area vested in the City of Bunbury with power to lease.

**COMMERCIAL TRIBUNAL - MORELLO PTY LTD-GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
SUPERANNUATION BOARD**

\$150 Costs Payment

15. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister assisting the Treasurer:
 - (1) In the matter heard on 15 October 1991 in the Commercial Tribunal of Western Australia between Morello Pty Ltd and the Government Employees Superannuation Board, (Ref. CT150 of 1990), which decision was handed down on 31 October 1991, awarding costs of \$150 to Morello Pty Ltd, has the applicant received the costs as awarded by the tribunal to the applicant?
 - (2) If no, why not?
 - (3) If yes, when were the costs paid and why was there undue delay in this matter?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister assisting the Treasurer has provided the following reply -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Payment was forwarded to Morello Pty Ltd by the Government Employees Superannuation Board's legal advisers on 12 March 1992.

The Chairman of the Commercial Tribunal indicated when delivering his decision on 31 October 1991 that it was usual for cost awards made in relation to interlocutory proceedings to be dealt with at the conclusion of the entire proceedings. The tribunal's final decision, on the order of costs, was received by the board's legal advisers on 3 February 1992 and forwarded to the board on 5 February 1992. The board deposited the \$150 with its legal advisers on 12 February 1992 and requested that they arrange payment.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SUPERANNUATION BOARD - SHOPPING CENTRES OWNERSHIP

Sinking Funds

16. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister assisting the Treasurer:

- (1) Which shopping centres in Western Australia are owned by the Government Employees Superannuation Board?
- (2) Does each of these shopping centres have a sinking fund?
- (3) If not, which centres do have a sinking fund?
- (4) Does the Government Employees Superannuation Board hold these funds?
- (5) If not, who does?
- (6) What is the total amount held by the Government Employees Superannuation Board in sinking funds?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister assisting the Treasurer has provided the following reply -

- (1) The only shopping centre owned by the Government Employees Superannuation Board is the Bullcreek shopping centre.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) No.
- (5) The managing agent holds the funds in a trust account.
- (6) The total amount held in trust by the managing agent as at 18 March 1992 was \$17 945.36.

NOISE POLLUTION - COMPLAINTS ON PRIVATE PROPERTY

Health Surveyors' Responsibility

28. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Are health surveyors responsible for following up noise pollution complaints on private property?
- (2) If yes, which section of which Act or regulation provides for such requirement?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Local Government has provided the following reply -

(1)-(2)

The Environmental Protection Authority has delegated to all shire clerks powers to issue and enforce pollution abatement notices with respect to noise. Where a request is received from a local authority, appropriately qualified environmental health officers are appointed as authorised persons and inspectors under sections 87 and 88 of the Environmental Protection Act and are thereby empowered to enforce the noise control provisions of the Environmental Protection Act.

TAFE - SHREDDED NOTEPAPER*Change of Address*

31. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it correct that five tonnes of Department of Technical and Further Education notepaper was shredded recently because of a change of address?
- (2) Is it correct that the shredded notepaper actually contained a large blank space for additional information, which could have included the change of address?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) No. Over the last month, DEVET's central equipment store despatched 10 crates of waste paper for reprocessing. The materials included outdated course information brochures and pamphlets, outdated enrolment and administrative forms, scrap paper from the department's print shop at the external studies TAFE college, and some letterhead paper which was discarded as a consequence of the establishment of a new Department of Employment, Vocational Education and Training.
- (2) Not applicable.

**HOMESWEST - LEEDERVILLE RAILWAY STATION DEVELOPMENT
PROPOSAL**

Public Meetings - Public Viewing of Plans

39. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Housing:

With reference to a Press article which appeared in *The Post* dated 11 February 1992 -

- (1) How many public meetings have been held concerning the proposed Homeswest development at proposed Leederville Railway Station?
- (2) Is it correct that the public can view plans for this proposed development at the Premier's electorate office?
- (3) At what other locations were the public able to view these plans?
- (4) Why was the Premier's electorate office chosen as a suitable venue for the public to view plans for the proposed development?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister for Housing has provided the following reply -

- (1) Two exhibitions, two public meetings, and two meetings with members of the Ratepayers Association and the Leederville Society.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) At the two exhibitions held on site, the consultant architect's office, and Homeswest head office.
- (4) As a convenient office within the area, and as a normal courtesy to the local member.

SCHOOLS - BALLAJURA SENIOR HIGH CONSTRUCTION PROPOSAL

88. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When is it intended to construct a senior high school at Ballajura and where will this school be located?
- (2) Is the Government utilising the facilities at the Morley Senior High School, Bramwell Road, Noranda, for use by students from the Ballajura area to delay construction of the proposed Ballajura Senior High School?
- (3) Are students from the Ballajura area being put to additional expense to travel to the Morley Senior High School than would be the case if the Ballajura Senior High School was operational?

- (4) Has the Minister been approached by parents of students from the Ballajura area seeking assistance in defraying the additional travelling costs being borne by Ballajura students attending Morley Senior High School?
- (5) If yes, does the Government intend to assist these parents, and if not, why not?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) If enrolments continue to increase at the present rate, a new high school to relieve Morley Senior High will be needed within the next three to four years. The combined primary and secondary school site in Ballajura is at the corner of Illawarra Crescent (S), and Cassowary Drive.
- (2) No.
- (3) Some students would not need to travel on Transperth transport if a new school was opened closer to their homes.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) As the students live within the area served by Transperth, the students pay a concessional fare of 50¢ per trip and the Government subsidises the difference between that fare and the cost of operating the service.

TAFE - OPTICAL DISPENSING COURSE
Enrolments - Funding Allocation

89. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many students are currently enrolled in the Optical Dispensing course at TAFE?
- (2) What funding has been allocated to this course during 1992?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) The optical dispensing course - advanced certificate - is delivered at the Mt Lawley TAFE campus, and has a total of 33 students enrolled: 12 in stage 1 and 21 in stage 2.
- (2) Funding to cover the salary cost of delivering the course is \$27 130 in 1992. Funding to cover consumable costs of approximately \$7 000 is shared between the optical dispensing and optical apprenticeship courses. It should be noted that this latter cost does not include the substantial provision of consumable items - frames, lenses, fluids, etc - free of charge, by the optical industry in the State.

BUILDERS REGISTRATION BOARD - MEMBERSHIP
Painters Registration Board - Membership

91. Hon GEORGE CASH to Hon John Halden representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Who are the current members of the Builders Registration Board and when are they appointed?
- (2) Who were the most recent members of the Builders Registration Board and when did their appointments terminate?
- (3) Why was there a substantial delay in the time taken to appoint new board members following the expiration of the terms of the previous board members?
- (4) Given the delay in appointing the current board members, on what dates has the board sat following their appointment?
- (5) Who are the current members of the Painters Registration Board?
- (6) When were these appointments approved by Executive Council?
- (7) Who were the previous members of the Painters Registration Board, and when did their terms expire?
- (8) What was the delay in appointing a new Painters Registration Board?

Hon JOHN HALDEN replied:

- (1) The current members and deputy members of the Builders Registration Board are as follows -

Mr F. McCardell
 Ms R. Savory
 Mr L. Lilleyman
 Mr A. Dalton
 Mr M. Mason
 Mr H. Neil
 Mr Lee Summers
 Mr Peter Mittonette
 Mr D. Retallack
 Mr A. Stoney
 Mr A. Todd
 Mr H. Johnson

Mr Todd and Mr Johnson were appointed on 19 December 1991. The remaining members were appointed on 3 March 1992.

- (2) The most recent members of the Builders Registration Board were as follows -

Mr F. McCardell
 Ms R. Savory
 Mr A. Dalton
 Mr H. Neil
 Mr Lee Summers
 Mr Peter Mittonette
 Mr D. Retallack
 Mr A. Todd
 Mr H. Johnson
 Mr R. Harrison
 Mr D. Barton
 Mr F. MacCormac

Mr Todd's and Mr Johnson's appointments will expire on 13 August 1992. The remaining members' appointments expired on 21 January 1992.

- (3) The six week delay in appointing a new board was due to the implementation of the new Home Building Contracts Act and the resultant amendments to the Builders Registration Act.
- (4) The Builders Registration Board does not have a meeting scheduled until 26 March 1992.
- (5)-(6) The new appointments to the Painters Registration Board are currently awaiting approval by Executive Council.
- (7) The previous members and deputy members of the Painters Registration Board were as follows -

Mr A. Remedio
 Mr F. Smith
 Ms M. Kiely
 Mr J. Gatt
 Ms R. Okely
 Mr J. Cooke
 Mr R. Harrison
 Mr K. Carde
 Mr R. Gipson

The appointments of these members expired on 4 February 1992.

- (8) The appointments to the Painters Registration Board have been hindered by some delay in processing as well as in the consultation process with industry groups regarding nominees.

BROOME RACETRACK - RELOCATION DECISION

94. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Has a decision been taken to relocate the Broome Racetrack to allow development close to Gantheaume Point?
- (2) If so, where will the racetrack be located?
- (3) Have the Broome Turf Club agreed to the terms of the relocation?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Lands has provided the following reply -

(1)-(3)

The possibility of the racecourse being relocated was raised with me when I was last in Broome but there is no formal application.

HOMESWEST - EXMOUTH

United States Navy Surplus Housing Purchase

96. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is the State Government considering taking over or purchasing housing that is surplus to requirements of the United States Navy in Exmouth?
- (2) If so, how many houses are being considered and for what purpose will they be used?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

Reply provided by the Minister for Housing -

- (1) Homeswest will not be purchasing any of these units.
- (2) Not applicable.

**STATE ENERGY COMMISSION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - HOMESWEST
TENANTS, BOOR STREET, CARNARVON**

Outstanding Accounts

98. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) How many tenants of Homeswest housing in Boor Street in Carnarvon are in arrears for their State Energy Commission of Western Australia accounts?
- (2) What are the individual amounts and how long have they been out standing?
- (3) What steps are being taken to collect these arrears?
- (4) Has cessation of the supply of electricity been contemplated?
- (5) If not, why not?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister for Fuel and Energy has provided the following reply -

(1)-(5)

SECWA's database is confidential and it is not appropriate to supply the information sought by the member.

CHILDREN'S COURT - APPEARANCES FOR OFFENCES STATISTICS

105. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Attorney General:

- (1) What was the total number of appearances for offences before the Children's Court in Western Australia in the year ended 30 June 1991?
- (2) What was the total number of appearances for offences before the Children's Court in the year ended 30 June 1991 by -

- (a) males; and
(b) females?
- (3) What was the number of offences brought before the Children's Court in the year ended 30 June 1991 in the following categories -
- (a) assault;
(b) drugs;
(c) firearms and explosives;
(d) fraud;
(e) good order;
(f) homicide;
(g) justice;
(h) liquor;
(i) property;
(j) robbery;
(k) sexual;
(l) theft; and
(m) other?
- (4) What was the total number of appearances of offenders before the Children's Court in the year ended 30 June 1991 in the following categories -
- (a) 1 appearance;
(b) 2 appearances;
(c) 3 appearances;
(d) 4 appearances;
(e) 5 appearances;
(f) 6-10 appearances; and
(g) 11-20 appearances?
- (5) Why was this information omitted from the Crown Law Department's annual report for 1990-91?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

All the statistics are derived from the Department for Community Services sources and are therefore subject to that department's counting rules. The Children's Court is in the process of developing its statistical base but at this time it cannot match the Department for Community Services for completeness and accuracy.

(1)	1990-91	13 921
(2)	Males	11 576
	Females	2 345
(3)		<u>1990-91</u>
	Assault	1 052
	Drugs	1 474
	Firearms and explosives	69
	Fraud	647
	Good order	2 873
	Homicide	4
	Justice	3 947
	Liquor	200
	Property	1 593
	Robbery	93

Sexual	140
Theft	15 673
Other*	<u>9 641</u>
	37 406

*"Other" includes 9 454 traffic offences.

(4)	<u>Total No of</u>	
	<u>Court Appearances</u>	<u>1991</u>
	One	3 945
	Two	1 401
	Three	734
	Four	454
	Five	337
	Six-10	719
	11-20	509
	Over 20	<u>185</u>
		8 285

- (5) The Children's Court historically has been dependent on the Department for Community Services for the provision of most court related statistics. The 1991 statistics from the Department for Community Services were not available in sufficient time to meet the deadline for the presentation of the Crown Law Department's annual report to Parliament in accordance with section 62(1) of the Financial Administration and Audit Act. With the transfer of statutory responsibility for the Children's Court to the Crown Law Department, the court has undertaken the establishment of its own statistical system. A more comprehensive statistical report on Children's Court activity is planned for inclusion in the Crown Law Department's 1991-92 annual report.

DISABLED - FEDERAL-STATE DISABILITY AGREEMENT

Kailis, Dr P.V. - Letter of Concern

109. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Disability Services:

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that he has received a letter from the president of Rocky Bay Inc, Dr P.V. Kailis, expressing concern at lack of consultation with service providers, carers and disabled people in Western Australia over the Commonwealth-State disability agreement?
- (2) If yes, can the Minister indicate what action has been taken as a result?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The following answer has been supplied by the Minister for Disability Services -

- (1) Dr Kailis has written about the Commonwealth-State disability agreement - CSDA - as it applies to therapy services and community access.
- (2) These issues are currently being considered and a reply will be sent to Dr P.V. Kailis.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

DAYLIGHT SAVING REFERENDUM - PUBLICATIONS

Editorial Comment Responsibility - Distribution Cost

38. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

- (1) Who provided the editorial comment in the referendum publication on daylight saving?

- (2) How many copies of the publication were produced, and at what cost?
- (3) What was the method of distribution of the publication throughout Western Australia, and what is the anticipated cost of distribution?
- (4) Were any costs incurred for interstate or overseas distribution of the publication?
- (5) If so, will he provide details?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for some notice of this question. The answer provided by the Minister responsible is as follows -

- (1) The editorial comment in the publication on the daylight saving referendum was provided by the National Party of Australia, Western Australia, for the "no" case on page 4 of the publication. The comment on the "yes" case on page 5 was provided by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia after obtaining the support of the other organisations listed in the second column on page 5. Commentary in other parts of the publication was provided by the Western Australian Electoral Commission in consultation with the advertising agency, Neville Jeffress Perth Pty Ltd.
- (2) The number of copies produced was 863 000 at a printing cost of \$236 618 - 27.3¢ for each supplement.
- (3) Distribution of the publication is through *The West Australian* and the *Sunday Times* and the majority of country newspapers at a cost of \$38 201.
- (4)-(5) No.

POLICE - SPEED GUNS EXPENDITURE
Gravel Roads Funding Allocation

39. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Can the Minister explain to the House, now that the best kept secret of Western Australia concerning speed guns has come out, how much money has he authorised the Police Department to spend on them?
- (2) How many will be bought?
- (3) Since the Government's coffers are open, will the Minister consider allocating some money to the Police Department so that its traffic officers can travel on gravel roads to carry out all their duties rather than part of their duties by travelling only on sealed roads?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(3)

Traffic officers are able to carry out their full duties under current instructions. It is wrong to suggest that they have limitations placed on them by not being able to travel on gravel roads. Police patrols are of course carried out on gravel roads. I am sure Hon Phil Lockyer has a number of gravel roads in his electorate. I would have thought the reason the pursuit vehicles do not travel on gravel roads was obvious to him. I have heard him complain about some gravel roads in some areas of his electorate which are a little potholed and not in the best condition, particularly after rain. Generally, it is not good practice for police vehicles designed for fast pursuit to travel on gravel roads. When he talks about vehicles being restricted to sealed roads, they are exactly the vehicles he is talking about.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: Do you mean traffic patrol vehicles?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Not all traffic patrol vehicles are prevented from using gravel roads.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: Which ones?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Those vehicles other than pursuit vehicles. Given the details required by the question I ask that it be put on notice and I will provide a full answer. It is somewhat unfortunate that the media grabbed hold of some comments made in Kalgoorlie by the Commissioner of Police when he was talking generally about road safety matters. I ask the member to be patient and I will provide all that information. It was planned to be made available at the road safety launch prior to Easter. The police view was that that would maximise the attention given to the road safety program. I hope that the media's releasing some of that information will not detract from that important road safety campaign.

POLICE - GRAVEL ROADS
Traffic Patrol Cars Ban

40. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Police:

I am disturbed by the Minister's explanation that only pursuit vehicles are not allowed to travel on gravel roads.

- (1) I understand that the traffic patrol uses only pursuit vehicles; that is, the ordinary cars which patrol the highways - those with the blue lights which from time to time Hon Eric Charlton has had the misfortune to be apprehended by. Are they banned from using gravel roads?
- (2) Is the Minister saying that the ordinary, general duties vehicles - which I concede are allowed on gravel roads - are the only ones used on gravel roads? I take it the patrol cars used as pursuit cars, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the potholed roads, are not used on gravel roads; in other words, no traffic patrol cars use the gravel roads?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(2)

General duties vans can be used for traffic patrol on gravel roads. The member has answered his own question.

TEACHERS - COUNTRY INCENTIVE SCHEME
Liberal Party Less Effective Scheme - Question Out of Order

41. Hon TOM HELM to the Minister for Education:

Is it the case that a scheme to be announced by the Liberal Party to attract teachers to country areas will be less effective than the Government's existing country incentive scheme?

Point of Order

Hon PETER FOSS: That is a question seeking an opinion.

The PRESIDENT: The question is out of order.

Questions without Notice Resumed

The PRESIDENT: Order! If members do not want to have questions without notice they should say so and we will get on with the Address-in-Reply.

POLICE - CRITICISM
Minister's and Commissioner of Police's Action

42. Hon E.J. CHARLTON to the Minister for Police:

Widespread criticism of the police, particularly in the media of late on a range of issues, has caused low morale among some police personnel. Does the Minister intend to take any action with the Commissioner of Police to ensure that these problems are overcome?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Unfortunately, the Commissioner of Police is not responsible for the media. I

am aware of a number of police officers who are doing positive work with some young offenders for which they are often not rewarded. An example of that is a couple of young police officers working in the northern suburbs with four offenders to build a vehicle which those four offenders will race. Another example is that of police officers in Roebourne who brought some Aboriginal basketball players to Perth. Police who are involved in that positive type of policing feel that too often the media, some sections of the public, and indeed some members of Parliament, take too critical a view of them and do not balance that criticism by recognising that they are involved in positive work as well as, by the nature of their work, being involved in areas that bring them into conflict with members of the community. I have discussed those matters with the Commissioner of Police.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Do you consider he is doing his job?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I certainly do consider that the Commissioner of Police is doing his job. I think that we have one of the best police commissioners in Australia. Certainly many of the initiatives reflected in our community policing initiatives have come directly from him. There was a catch in the member's question in that he asked whether police morale has declined because of the criticism being levelled at them. There seems to be some criticism of the commissioner inherent in the member's question.

Hon E.J. Charlton: If you take it that way, you are correct.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I think that opinion is unfair and unwarranted. Most police, including the commissioner, believe that no matter what they do, they will be criticised. Most of them believe also that, despite that criticism, they will get on and do the job as best they can.

SCHOOLS - PRIMARY *Number of Students Requirement*

43. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Education:

What number of primary students is required as a stable number for the Government to supply a teacher, or teachers, and school buildings?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

If the member puts his question on notice I will supply the information.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING FUND - LEVY PAYMENTS

*Building of Farm Sheds, Dams, Irrigation Systems, Air Strips, Fences, Roads, Drainage
Ditches, Stockyards*

44. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH to the Minister for Education:

Are levies under the building construction industry training fund payable on the building of farm sheds, dams, irrigation systems, air strips, fences, roads, drainage ditches, and stockyards?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:-

The levy is payable on constructions within the State. If the member wants any further information he should put the question on notice. The BCITF was agreed to by industry and Government. It came into being after an exemption from the Australian guarantee levy was granted under Federal legislation. Despite all the work that went on, it seems to have caused some concern to sectors of our community, including local government. I understand a number of concerns have been raised when various sectors meet with the board of the BCITF and mostly those concerns have been allayed and sensible arrangements made.

If the member puts his question on notice it would be useful if he indicated the sorts of concerns that have inspired his question, because the matter is a complex one.

TEACHERS - COUNTRY INCENTIVE SCHEME
Liberal and Labor Party Differences

45. Hon TOM HELM to the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister explain the differences recently announced by the Liberal Party to attract teachers to country areas, and the Government's existing country incentive scheme?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I thank the honourable member for drawing attention to the discrepancy between the two provisions. I do not wonder that Mr Foss tried to have the original question ruled out of order.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not call the Minister for Education again if she continues to defy the rules of this House. It is out of order for the Minister to impose her view on the decision made by the President. The President saw fit to rule the point of order a legitimate point of order. If the Minister or anyone disagrees, there is a proper and appropriate action for them to take. If the Minister is unfamiliar with that proper procedure perhaps she should pop into my office afterwards and I will tell her how to go about it. It is not proper for her to comment on a point of order raised by another member in the middle of answering a question from Hon Tom Helm. I am sick and tired of question time being turned into a pantomime by members from both sides of the House. It is a futile exercise to devote half an hour to what seems to be a competition between members as to who can outsmart the other. That is not what question time in Parliament is about; it is about seeking information and receiving it. It is supposed to be the time for members to gather information. The Minister for Education may think that I am singling her out; however, funny situations like this always seem to occur when a question is asked of her. I know that, if a Minister has a prepared answer, he or she wants to use it, no matter how many shots the member has at asking it. That is not for me to determine. I am happy to listen to the answer, because I am always seeking information. However, let us at least make it look like we are fair dinkum about what we are doing.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity to draw a comparison between the two schemes. I understand it is embarrassing for the Liberal Party. It announced a program similar to a program put in place by the Government, which gives greater incentive over six years than does the Liberal scheme over 10 years. It was introduced by the Liberal Party with a great fanfare. A deficiency in the Liberal Party's scheme is that schools in the member's electorate which have staff stability problems will not be assisted because it encourages flying visits by teachers to build up merit points with short term stays in country areas.

I need to make it clear that teachers will not respond favourably to a number of matters, and perhaps Hon Philip Lockyer should advise them that they will be worse off under the Liberal Party's incentive scheme. Hon Philip Lockyer should tell his teachers that it will take them 10 years to accrue the same financial benefit under the Liberal Party scheme than it takes them to accrue in six years under the existing Government scheme. It is of concern to people who are interested in the stability of staff in schools across the State that teachers at the schools where people are queuing up for appointment will get an incentive. That is a ridiculous waste of resources. It is a very ill-conceived program, surprisingly made without the knowledge of what already exists for teachers.
